DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 306 HE 004 408

AUTHOR	Burt, Samuel M.
TITLE	An Overview of the Dilemma of the College Undergraduate Transfer Student: Implications for National Policy Relating to Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Federal Interagency Committee on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	170p.; For use by the FICE Task Force on Transfer of Credits in Higher Education
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; Credits; Educational Mobility; Experimental Programs; Higher Education; Relocation; *Student Mobility; Students; Transfer Programs; *Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

This document focuses on the problems of transferring credit facing undergraduate transfer students. Following introductory material, chapter 2 discusses the major dimensions of the dilemma. Chapter 3 covers articulation between junior and senior institutions of higher education. Chapter 4 reviews nontraditional study and external degree programs. Armed services personnel and prison inmates as college transfer students are studied in chapter 5 and 6. Chapter 7 reviews current studies by national educational organizations. Major findings indicate the ratio of new transfer students to freshmen has risen from 7.5% in 1963 to 8.1% in 1968. More mature and more nontraditional students will be seeking college degrees, many of them with previous college courses or life experiences creditable toward a degree. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081306

HE

AN OVERVIEW OF THE DILEMMA OF THE COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFER STUDENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL POLICY RELATING TO HIGHER EDUCATION

by: Samuel M. Burt

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for
Task Force on Transfer of Creditts in Higher Education
Federal Interagency Committtee on Education
U.S. Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Edducation and Welfare
Washington, D).C.

November, 19772

HE 004 408

FEDERAL INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Task Force on Transfer of Credits
in Higher Education

Marie Martin, Chairman
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Nathan Brodsky
Director for Education Programs
and Management Training
Office of Assistant Secretary
of Defense (Education)
Department of Defense
Washington, D.C. 20301

Mr. James Sylar 223C
Education and Rehabilitation
Service
Veterans Administration
810 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20420

Mr. Earl Teeter
Program Development and
Evaluation Staff
Office of Personnel
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

Dr. Lyle W. Phillips
Head, Office of Experimental
Projects and Programs
Directorate of Education
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Mr. Alex Lathers
Employee Development Specialist
1900 - E Street, N.W.
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, D.C. 20415

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FORWARD I

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS III

CHAPTERS

1. Introduction 1-1

2. The Major Dimensions of the Dilemma 2-1

   A. Some Numbers and Percentages Relating to Transfer Students 1

   B. Vocational and Technical Education Course Transfer and CASE 5

   C. Meaningfulness of Grades in the Transfer Process 9

   D. Role of Regional Accrediting Agencies 15

   E. Student Mobility and Tuition Costs 19

   F. Significance of Decreasing Freshman Enrollments 26

3. Articulation Between Junior and Senior Institutions of Higher Education 3-1

4. Non-Traditional Study and External Degree Programs 4-1

   A. The College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). 2

   B. The New York State Board of Regents External Degree Program 7

   C. Home Study Programs 8

   D. Potential Impact of External Degree Programs on College Admission Procedures for Transfer Students 10

   E. National Examining and Accrediting University 15

Page

5. Armed Services Personnel 5-1

A. The Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges 8

B. Committee on Institutional Cooperation 12

C. Expanded Use of the CLEP Examinations by the Armed Services 14

D. The Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) 15

6. Prison Inmates and Releases as College Transfer Students 6-1

7. Current Studies by National Educational Organizations . . . 7-1

A. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges 2

B. College Entrance Examination Board 3

C. American Association for Higher Education 3

D. Association of University Evening Colleges 3

E. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges 3

F. The American Council on Education 4

G. Additional National Studies 5

8. Summary of Major Findings; Some Additional Comments, Questions, and a Recommendation 8-1

APPENDICES

Page

A. Some Major Policies and Practices of Admissions Offices Relating to Applicants Seeking Transfer from One Institution of Higher Education to Another A-1

B. Critical Articulation Incidents and Problems of the College Student Transfer Process B-1

C. Some Articulation Problems within Selected State Systems of Higher Education C-1

TABLES

Page

1. Variety of Requirements to be Met by Transfer Students for Admission to Four-Year Colleges, Fall 1970 1-2

2. Illinois Colleges and Universities Participating in Statewide Study of Admissions Policies and Practices for Transfer Students, School Year 1967-68 1-4

3. Selected Miscellaneous National Estimate Data Concerning Students Transferring to Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 1966 2-1

4. Status of Undergraduate Students in All Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1968 2-2

5. Number of Students Who Transferred from Various Types of Institutions of Higher Education to 624 Senior Institutions, Fall 1970 2-3

6. Percentage of Transfer Students Entering at Various Class Levels in 624 Senior Receiving Institutions, Fall 1970 2-4

7. Primary Reasons Transfer Students Selected Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education as Perceived by 624 College Personnel Administrators, Fall 1970 2-19

8. College Enrollments, 1967-1979 2-29

9. Undergraduate College Course Completions by Armed Services Personnel, 1971 5-1

10. Federal Prison Offender Participation in Selected Institutional Education Programs, 1971 6-1

FOREWORD

The Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) was established by Presidential order in 1964 (Executive Order 11185) to coordinate the wide-ranging educational activities of Federal agencies. Its major purpose is to engage in a continuing appraisal of the relationship between Federal educational programs and the educational needs and goals of the Nation in order to develop sound public policy and to facilitate coordination of Federal educational activities.

FICE consists of representatives of 25 Federal agencies. Members are usually the chief educational policy officer of the agency or his designate. The chairman is the Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The monthly plenary sessions customarily involve 30 to 40 conferees, including guests and consultants from educational organizations outside the government. Subcommittees, task forces, and other work groups are appointed to deal with particular issues as deemed appropriate by FICE. Among the areas of concern currently being addressed are career education, educational consumer protection, education and the arts, and higher education for disadvantaged minorities.

The Task Force on Transfer of Credits in Higher Education was established early in 1970. It was the result of discussions initiated by the Department of Defense concerning the growing number of Armed Services personnel seeking undergraduate college education and degrees at the baccalaureate level. As transient students, enrolling in different colleges and universities as they are moved from one post to another,

servicemen are finding it difficult to transfer academic credit from one institution to the next.

A review of this problem with staff of the Veterans Administration, the U.S. Office of Education and with other Federal agencies and with the American Council on Education revealed a similar situation with respect to mobile civilian students. Except for recognizing that the severity of the problem appeared to be increasing, however, there was little data on the number of students involved and the diversity of major causative factors. To develop necessary background information and to suggest possible directions to resolve problems was the assignment given the Task Force.

Samuel M. Burt, formerly special assistant to the Dean, College of Continuing Education, The American University, Washington, D.C., and currently an educational consultant, was employed by the Task Force to review and assemble information available on the credit transfer problems of undergraduate students. This report presents the findings of his study.

Dr. Marie Martin
Chairman, FICE
Task Force on Transfer of
Credits in Higher Education

Bernard Michael
Executive Director
Federal Interagency Committee
on Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to many individuals for the assistance they provided during the course of his research and development of his findings and interpretations. He is particularly grateful to Dr. Marie Martin, director, Community College Education, U.S. Office of Education, and chairman of the task force established by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) to investigate the national implications of the problems of the undergraduate college transfer student. Dr. Martin gave generously of her time in guiding the author in his study, and free rein in pursuit of his inquiries.

To Bernard Michael, executive director of FICE, the author expresses appreciation for constant inspiration and guidance. Mr. Michael's broad experience in all facets of the educational world and his knowledge of institutional operating methods were most helpful at several critical points during the study.

Dr. W. Todd Furniss, director, Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education, provided invaluable assistance, information and direction. Dr. Furniss' continuing interest in resolving the problems of the transfer student has been a constant source of encouragement to the author in his exploration of the many-faceted subject.

To Dr. Nathan Brodsky, director, Education Programs and Management Training, Office of the Secretary of Defense, the author is indebted for guidance and assistance in developing the difficult chapter dealing with Armed Services personnel. Dr. Brodsky and his staff went out of their way to provide requested information and data. In addition, Dr. Brodsky

met several times with the author in revising various drafts of the entire report.

Mr. Lee J. Betts, assistant director, Programs for Servicemen and Veterans of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges was most helpful in the development of the information concerning Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges. This new movement has considerable significance for Armed Services personnel seeking a college education and degree.

The assistance of John Valley and Albert Serling of the Educational Testing Service in developing the information concerning the College-Level Examination Program is gratefully acknowledged.

Appreciation is expressed to Ms. Sylvia McCollum, director of Educational Resources, Federal Bureau of Prisons, for providing the information for the chapter dealing with the problems of prison inmates and releasees as college transfer students.

For the chapter in this paper dealing with research being conducted by national higher education associations, the author is indebted to Herbert Stutts, acting dean, College of Continuing Education, The American University, Washington, D.C. The author is also indebted to the academic advisors of the College for providing him numerous case studies, and insights, based on their experience in dealing with college transfer students.

To Ms. Dorothy Mackin, counselor in the Admission Office of the American University, the author is grateful for the time she spent in acquainting him with the intricacies of admissions office procedures.

The author is particularly pleased to acknowledge the considerable assistance of Ms. Mary I. Allan, Librarian, National Center for Higher Education, American Council on Education, in locating some of the important research reports on which this paper is based.

Dr. Frank Dickey, executive director of the National Commission on Accrediting, and Dr. Robert Kirkwood, executive director of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education were most helpful in clarifying important questions concerning accrediting associations.

For their in-depth review of the draft manuscript and detailed suggestions for revision and addition the author expresses his appreciation to:

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, president,
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Dr. J. Douglas Conner, executive secretary, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers

Dr. Richard W. Millard, director, Higher Education Services, Education Commission of the States

Dr. Calvin Dellefield, executive director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

To members of the Task Force the author is especially grateful for their advice and guidance during the course of this study.

To Ms. Phyllis Stone and Ms. Barbara Coates, of the FICE Office staff, who typed drafts of this report, and Ms. Katherine Hunter, who typed final copy, the author is most grateful for a difficult job well done.

Samuel M. Burt
December 1, 1972

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As a general rule, students seeking to transfer from one institution of higher education to another will experience no difficulty in transferring course credits if they have a C+ grade average or better, are in good standing at an accredited institution, and make no change in their major program of studies, except....

The exceptions in policies and practices among colleges and universities for accepting transfer students are almost as diverse in number and variety as there are insitutions. Reactions of researchers concerned with the problems faced by undergraduate college transfer students range from that of Winandy and Grath who stated,

> "Transfer students...are too often the victims of whim and fancy."[1]

to the more restrained observation of Hoy that,

> "Unfortunately, most student transfers are accomplished in isolated patterns with only a modest degree of co-operation between the institutions."[2]

---

[1] Donald H. Winandy and Robert A. McGrath, "A Study of Admissions Policies and Practices for Transfer Students in Illinois", College and University, Winter, 1970. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C.

[2] John C. Hoy, "Admission of the Transfer Student to Upper Class Standing" (chapter in Asa S. Knowles, editor-in-chief, Handbook of College and University Administration: Academic, New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1970)

There is more than sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that while a number of colleges and universities welcome the transfer student as a means for filling class vacancies created by normal upperclassmen attrition, most institutions of higher education appear less than enthusiastic. Most institutions relegate the undergraduate transfer student to second class status in the admissions process as well as in services provided once he is enrolled.

The diversity of patterns of admission requirements applied to transfer students by colleges and universities throughout the United States was reported in a recent study of 624 senior (4-year) institutions which enrolled a total of 209,368 transfer students in the Fall of 1970. It should be noted that a number of the institutions insisted that all the requirements listed in Table 1 be met if the grade-point average achieved by the student at his previous college was at a questionably acceptable level of the receiving institution.

TABLE 1

Variety of Requirements to be Met by Transfer Students for Admission to Four Year Colleges Fall 1970[3]

REQUIREMENTS	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS (TOTAL - 624) YES	NO
Achievement Tests	135	489
Scholastic Aptitude Test	267	357
Minimum high school GPA or rank	173	451
Minimum GPA for previous college study	507	117
Minimum number of academic credits	179	445
Interview with an institutional official	194	430
Physical examination	522	102
Application fee	523	101
Information concerning previous disciplinary action	432	192

[3]Arthur Sundeen and Thomas Goodale, "Student Personnel Programs and the Transfer Student", NASPA Journal, Volume 9, Number 3, January 1972 (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Bloomington, Indiana).

It is interesting to note that despite the fact all these students were transferring from one college to another, slightly more than 25% of the receiving institutions required the high school record, and over 40% required the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Both these requirements must also be met by entering freshmen in order to determine potential for success in college studies. That a college record is already available for the transfer student seems to make no difference in the entrance requirements. Thus a "late bloomer" student whose college record does meet the minimal admissions requirements could be rejected by the more selective colleges because of a poor high school record.

Hoy's statement concerning the lack of cooperation between colleges and universities in dealing with the transfer student is very much an understatement of the problem when analyzed in terms of actual admissions office practices (see Appendices A, B and C). A good case could be made that institutions of higher education view each other with considerable suspicion as to the quality of course offerings and academic standards, regardless of accreditation status!

An illustration of this lack of cooperation and insistence by individual institutions in maintaining their own standards and requirements for admission of transfer students is the report describing admissions policies and practices of Illinois colleges and universities during 1967-1968. In that year more than 30,000 students had transferred from one college to another, including some 7,500 (25%) transfers from senior institutions to two-year public colleges. Of the 100 institutions of higher education in Illinois, all but one participated in the study, as indicated in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Illinois Colleges and Universities Participating in Statewide Study of Admissions Policies and Practices for Transfer Students School Year 1967-68[4]

TYPE OF INSTITUTION	NUMBER
Public Universities	8
Public Two-Year Colleges	33
Private Universities	9
Private Four-Year Colleges	38
Private Two-Year Colleges	11
TOTAL	99

Summarizing the results of this survey, Winandy and McGrath[5] found that:

1. One-third of all the institutions do not define what a transfer student means to them. Almost 50% of the public two-year colleges report they have no definition. Among those institutions which had definitions, the following were offered:
   a. A person who has at some time registered at another college whether or not he completed any work.
   b. A student who presents:
      (1) six semester hours of credit
      (2) 10, 12, and 15 semester hours of credit
      (3) 17 quarter hours of credit.
   c. College attendance one term or more.
   d. Applicants with at least one year but not more than two years of full-time college work.

[4]Winandy and McGrath, op cit.

[5]Winandy and McGrath, op cit.

2. Most two-year colleges do not require a minimum grade point average for admission of transfer students while most senior institutions do.
3. Almost one-half of the institutions will admit a student whose transcript states he is in good standing regardless of his grade point average.
4. Three multicampus institutions classify a student who changes campus as a "transfer." These include an institution that publishes a single catalog and faculty listing for all its campuses.
5. Approximately 25% of the institutions classify as a "transfer", a student with extension, correspondence or examination credit. However, most institutions consider only credit earned in residence.
6. At only two senior institutions does a student holding an associate degree from a junior college have an advantage over the non-graduate. Nor does the associate degree satisfy the general education requirements of four year colleges. This despite the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education which is so designed that students are expected to normally progress from two-year to four-year institutions.
7. Over 50% of the institutions reported they would accept "D" grades for transfer, but 2/3 of the private institutions would not.
    a. Some limitations on the affirmative responses included allowances that 15%, 20% or 25% of work transferred could be "D" grades if the overall transferable grade point average is high enough.

B. Approximately 25% of the institutions, almost all non-public, and five public two-year colleges, allow credit only for courses that are counterparts to their own courses.

The Winandy and McGrath study makes the obvious point that the transfer student despite his numbers, is often considered as something of an educational oddity. When he applies for transfer, he is taking his chances on the number of credit hours which will be accepted for transfer by any particular institution. He rarely knows how his previous record will be evaluated, and a number of institutions (1/3) fail to provide a student with a copy of his transfer credits until he appears for registration. Since public junior college enrollment was 40.1% of enrollment in Illinois public higher education in 1968 and continuing to grow, and most graduates who go on to higher education will transfer to senior institutions in Illinois, there is certainly an imperative for developing rational policies and some standardization of practices to overcome many of the absurdities currently affecting the transfer student in Illinois. Some of the major problems faced by the Illinois system in attempting to systematize its transfer student admissions policies and practices are described in Appendix C.

Illinois does not appear to be worse nor better than any of the other state systems of higher education with respect to admissions of the transfer student. So diverse are the admissions requirements that Barron's Educational Series has seen a market for a Handbook[6] to assist

[6]Nicholas C. Proia and Barbara J. Drysdale, Barron's Handbook of College Transfer Information (Woodbury, New York; Barron's Educational Series, Incorporated, 1971 (Revision)). Also, see, The College Handbook, (Princeton, J.J.; College Entrance Examination Board, 1972)

the transfer student in selecting a college in which he may be admitted. The Handbook lists, by states, whether or not any of the following requirements are applicable to each institution in that state:

High School Record
Minimum Grade Point Average
Minimum Credit Hours
Tests (including types of tests)
Semester, quarter-hours, etc.
Recommendations
D grades transfer with degree
A.A. degree for junior class status
Deadline dates for applications
Financial aid available

Not listed, unfortunately, is information of importance to a growing number of transfer students as to whether or not the colleges will accept:

Correspondence courses
College Level Examination Program General and Subject Examinations
United States Armed Forces Institute correspondence courses and examinations
Education and training programs provided by the Armed Forces

For this information, an applicant must still refer to individual institution catalogs.

But college catalogs usually raise more questions than they answer for the transfer student. The information relating to the transfer student is too often vague, unorganized and dispersed throughout the catalog according to Robert R. Anstett, Coordinator for Transfer Student Admissions at the State University of New York, Buffalo. He points out that the transfer applicant frequently has to assemble a mass of confusing and sometimes contradictory, information from the receiving institution, and comes "to view the transfer process as a mysterious procedure not fully understood until long after arriving at the college to which he had transferred.[7]

[7]Robert R. Anstett, "Transfer Made Easier," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 50, No. 10, June, 1972 (American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.)

To eliminate much of the confusion, Anstett's institution has published a manual for use by students seeking to transfer to SUNY (Buffalo).

> "No longer is the prospective student required to piece together information received from different sources. No longer is he required to wait until enrolling at the institution before completely understanding how he arrived. The bulletin has been developed to provide the student with the information he desires and needs to know about transferring before entering the process."[8]

Of particular interest to this research paper are the special departmental requirements for transfer students as described in the SUNY (Buffalo) manual. Some of these are listed below:

> "1. Architecture--All entering students should have the equivalent of two years of college level courses equaling at least 60 credit hours. It is recommended that these studies include the humanties and some specialization in subjects related to architecture such as engineering, construction technology, drawing and design. An applicant who does not have the required 60 credit hours may apply for special permission for entrance from the Admissions Committee of the School of Architecture and Environmental Design.
>
> "2. Art--A portfolio is required of prospective Studio Art applicants, including Art Education. The portfolio is not required of Art History applicants. For specific details contact the Art Department, State University of New York at Buffalo, 4240 Ridge Lea Campus, Amherst, New York.
>
> "3. Biology--Transfer applicants wishing to gain acceptance into the BIOLOGY MAJOR program are well advised to complete Inorganic Chemistry and Calculus as freshmen, and Organic Chemistry and Physics in the sophomore year. Students should also complete one or more courses in Biology (Botany or Zoology) with a "B" grade or better by the end of the sophomore year. Specific questions should be addressed to the Committee for Undergraduate Affairs, Department of Biology, 102 Health Sciences Building, State University of New York at Buffalo.
>
> "4. Chemistry--Students should complete one semester of Analytical Chemistry and two semesters of Physics, Calculus and Organic Chemistry before transferring. Those interested in continuing in Chemistry at the post-graduate level are also urged to take two semesters of German.

---

[8] Anstett, ibid

Transfer courses may be used to satisfy major program requirements if they are similar to courses offered at Buffalo, and require the same pre-requisites.

"5. Computer Science--Students intending to transfer as sophomores should have taken at least one semester of mathematics at the level of calculus, modern or linear algebra. Students transferring in as juniors should have taken at least an additional semester of mathematics and a semester of computer science. Enrollment in the program is limited, and therefore, applicants are expected to have a good to excellent grade record for consideration.

"6. Elementary Education--Closed to transfer students because of space limitation.

"7. Engineering--Students who satisfactorily complete a two-year engineering science transfer curriculum should be prepared to enter the junior year of an engineering program at Buffalo. Programs for a B.S. degree have been arranged so that those who need to complete the technical courses required in the specialized engineering areas at Buffalo will have an opportunity to do so without loss of time."[9]

While SUNY (Buffalo) has made the effort to bring together into a single publication its policies and practices for admitting transfer students, this can be viewed only as shedding light on the surface of an extremely deep-rooted problem. Even if all New York State universities were to publish the same type of booklet, the tremendous diversity of policies and practices within the system would still exist.

There is nothing in the literature to suggest that researchers and authorities are opposed to diversity of educational programs, perceived missions, and academic freedom in and among institutions of higher education. However, they are concerned about the irrationality of the variety of admissions policies, procedures and practices. In support of a degree of diversity for good reasons, Richard W. Millard, director of Higher Education Services of the Education Commission of the States, points out that the transfer student really presents two different, but closely related, problems:

---

[9] Anstett, ibid.

"One is the problem of acceptance of credit and the other is the requirements for completion of a program or degree. These two frequently get confused in the institutions themselves and the situation is aggravated by the fact that in a number of institutions the baccalaureate degree must be acquired within a certain specified number of hours. As a result, what appears to be unwillingness to accept transfer credits may in fact be nonrelevance of the work in question to the program the student has chosen. The latter may be a more difficult problem than the first in terms of transferability and I am sure plagues students from occupational or vocational backgrounds more than other students. In certain so-called vertical fields it becomes a far more pressing issue than in fields that in general are horizontal in character.... One possible approach to this is to recognize that in certain fields at least completion of the program and degree requirements may take longer than four years depending upon the particular academic background with which the student comes. Psychologically there is no question but that it would be advantageous for an institution to say that we accept all of the credits transferred but that the programmatic requirements must be fulfilled even though this may take five instead of four years."[10]

W. Todd Furniss, Director, Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education suggests that

"....many private institutions serve (and survive) by offering a program that depends for its success on the admission of a unique student body and the offering of a very special kind of program. To date, they have used the panoply of restrictive admissions and transfer regulations as a means of selecting the special students their character requires. If these means were denied them, they would have to find others that would do the same job, and if they were unable to find such other means, the institution might lose its special character and thus its clientele -- and die.... In fact, of course, these special institutions enroll only a very small part of the college population."[11]

Dr. Furniss further suggests that liberalization of transfer policies by public senior institutions of higher education is an attainable goal, and that certain private institutions might then follow suit.[12]

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, indicates several factors contributing to the diversity of transfer practices among senior institutions.

---

[10] In a letter dated September 11, 1972 to Bernard Michael, executive director, Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

[11] In a letter dated August 29, 1972 to Bernard Michael, executive director Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

[12] Ibid

> "Part of the transfer problem, at the present time, can be attributed to the fact that there has been a tremendous expansion of educational opportunity at the immediate post secondary levels. People of all ages and from various socioeconomic backgrounds are encouraged now to enroll for post secondary education. However, there has not been a parallel expansion of educational opportunity and capacity at the upper division levels, nor has there been a change in programs or in learning strategies to match the kind of accommodation to the characteristics of the student population that has taken place at lower division levels. One of the big problems we face therefore, is the fact that many students who have been encouraged to continue with two years of education beyond the high school and whose level of aspirations as well as their achievements now suggest that they continue with upper division work are finding it difficult to find appropriate upper division educational programs."[13]

In view of the efforts of a number of authorities to justify to some extent the rationale of the diversity of transfer student admission policies and practices among institutions of higher education, it is interesting to note one of the major findings of the Newman report, that,

> "....our colleges and universities have become extraordinarily similar. Nearly all 2500 institutions have adopted the same mode of teaching and learning. Nearly all strive to perform the same generalized educational mission. .... Even the differences in character of individual institutions are fading. It is no longer true that most students have real choices among differing institutions in which to seek a higher education.[14]

Newman's finding of a "homogenization of higher education" may be true for every facet of higher education except one--admissions criteria for transfer students. Perhaps the admissions officers and faculties of many colleges and universities have established a final bastion of diversity for their institutions, even if this diversity is based on nothing more than bureaucratic red tape of the admissions office to which have been added a variety of requirements supposedly reflecting a sense of special institutional mission.

[13] In a letter dated August 31, 1972 to Bernard Michael, executive director, Federal Interagency Committee on Education

[14] Report on Higher Education (Washington, D.C., Office of Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1971, Page 12).

The detailed procedures and special considerations involved in determining a transfer applicant's eligibility for admission requires many admissions office staffs to spend a considerable amount of time in checking previous college catalogs to determine whether the course offered for transfer credit is a counterpart of a course offered at the receiving college, computing grade point averages, and a whole host of other computational and clerical activities. There is a mystique around the admissions process which baffles the comprehension of students, faculty, administrators, and government officials concerned with higher education. There is fairly universal agreement that this must be changed. For the admissions process can and does have an important impact on the present as well as on the future of the transfer student, particularly if any courses previously taken and paid for at one college are rejected by the receiving institution. Sometimes, in order to avoid repetition of course work, extra time in college, and additional tuition expenses, a transfer student will change his study plans just to be admitted to an institution which will accept all his previous course work and grades so that he can obtain a college degree in a minimum time period. This happens particularly when a student meets the institution's general admission requirements, but is rejected by the department of his major study. He then has the options of changing to another department of major study which will accept any student who meets the institution's general admissions requirements, or attempt to enroll in another institution. However, the latter option is frequently estopped because the student is notified of the college's decision too late to initiate the admissions procedure in another institution for immediate enrollment. Practically all colleges and universities defer review of applications from transfer students in favor of freshmen applicants.

Many commentators have long been calling for reforms in the transfer student admissions policies such as simplication, standardization, or at least greater articulation between public two-year and four-year institutions within a state system. Other commentators feel that despite some validity to the arguments of the reformers, the "horrible case studies" are typical of a mere handful of students. What little hard data and evidence is available in the literature can be used to make a plausible case for either side of the controversy, depending, usually, on whether the student or the institution is being considered. As indicated in the next section of this paper, it has been estimated that approximately 13% of the transfer students lose the equivalent of at least one semester's credit hours in the process. Shall we be indignant about this, or shall we point with satisfaction to the 87% of the students who do not lose one semester's credit, and forget about other students who lose less than a semester's credit? Or, from the viewpoint of national policy relating to higher education, isn't there a third side to the argument?

CHAPTER 2

THE MAJOR DIMENSIONS OF THE DILEMMA

A. Some Numbers and Percentages Relating to Transfer Students

That the "Illinois Story" is typical of many state systems of higher education is confirmed by several studies conducted during the late 1960's and supported by several investigations reported in the past two years. A 1966 landmark study of 146 four-year colleges closely representative of all colleges in the U.S. permitted projection of the data on a national basis. The absolute numbers, and some of the trends postulated by the authors of the study, Willingham and Findikyan, are invalidated to some extent, of course, by the unforeseen dramatic changes which have taken place in our economy, our society, and on our campuses during the last five years. However, many of the relationships between the various aspects of the student transfer problem are undoubtedly valid and certainly useful for analytic purposes. Set forth in Table 3 below are selected miscellaneous data provided by that study which permits important insights and allows for interpolation with data from more recent studies.

TABLE 3[1]

Selected Miscellaneous National Estimate Data Concerning Students Transferring to Four-Year Colleges and Universities Fall, 1966

1.	Number of applicants	431,800
2.	Number of applicants who actually enrolled	233,800 (54%)
3.	Percent of applicants with grade levels from previous college:	
	a. C+ and over (2.5 and above)	45%
	b. C (2.0 - 2.4)	34%
	c. C- (under 2)	21%

[1] Warren W. Willingham and Nurhan Findikyan, Patterns of Admission for Transfer Students, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1969.

4. Percent of applicants rejected 32%
5. Rejection rate of applicants by previous type of college:
   a. Four-year college 35%
   b. Two-year college transfer 24%
   c. Two-year Vocational and Technical 62%
6. Percent of transfer students from two-year colleges 43%
7. Rejection rate of students with C- or better averages who were applying for transfer from public two-year colleges to public four-year institutions in same state 10%
8. Percent of students who lost at least one semester's credit after transferring 13%
9. Percent of students receiving financial aid 14%
   (Note: Percent of all new freshmen receiving financial aid was 33%)

Before commenting on the significance of the above data, additional information from two other studies is presented.

The most recent valid national enrollment statistics concerning transfer students is available from a U.S. Office of Education study of Fall, 1968 enrollments in 2,495 institutions of higher education.[2] Conducted in cooperation with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, it was found that new transfer students in 1968 numbered 455,867, approximately 8.0% of the total undergraduate student body.

TABLE 4

Status of Undergraduate Students in All Institutions of Higher Education Fall, 1968[3]

UNDERGRADUATE STATUS	ALL INSTITUTIONS NUMBER	ALL INSTITUTIONS PERCENT	PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS NUMBER	PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS PERCENT	PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS NUMBER	PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS PERCENT
Total	5,683,300	100	4,068,204	100	1,615,096	100
First-time students	1,571,579	27.7	1,155,420	28.4	416,159	25.8
New transfer students	455,867	8.0	355,724	8.7	100,143	6.2
Returning students	3,655,854	64.3	2,557,060	62.9	1,098,794	68

[2]Residence and Migration of College Students, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1970 (Note: This same study will be conducted again in 1973).

[3]Arthur Sundeen and Thomas Goodale, op. cit.

It is of interest to note that this number is almost exactly double the number of enrolled transfer students as estimated in the 1966 study by Willingham and Findikyan. Additional supporting evidence that the Willingham and Findikyan study underestimated the number of transfer students enrolled in college (or that there has been a tremendous increase between 1966 and 1970) is the study of 624 senior institutions which reported enrolling 209,368 transfer students in 1970.[4] As will be noted from Table 5, the study included many more institutions than the Willingham and Findikyan study, but did not project the findings nationally, yet there were almost as many transfer students enrolled in the 624 institutions in 1970 as estimated for all institutions in 1966!

TABLE 5

Number of Students Who Transferred From Various Types of Institutions of Higher Education To 624 Senior Institutions Fall, 1970[4]

INSTITUTIONS TRANSFERRED FROM	NUMBER	PERCENT
Community-Junior Colleges	117,254	55
Public four-year institutions	56,692	27
Private four-year institutions	35,422	18

While Willingham and Findikyan estimated that the percentage of transfer students from two-year institutions in 1966 was 43%, Sundeen and Goodale found the percentage was 55% in 1970. This finding is consistent with the increasing number of community and junior colleges opened and their growing enrollments--during the intervening years. Unfortunately, no data is available on this matter from the U.S. Office of Education 1968 study.

[4] Sundeen and Goodale, ibid.

Table 6 further supports the probability that a major percentage of students transferring to senior institutions came from two-year junior and community colleges. While it is indicated that 42% of the transfer students entered the four-year institutions in the junior year, it is quite likely that many entering in the freshmen and sophomore classes actually had graduated from junior and community colleges. This statement is supported by Willingham and Findikyan's finding that 13% of the transfer students lost at least one semester or more of credit when transferring. Furthermore, if senior institutions were to liberalize their admissions practices to lower the rejection rate of junior and community college vocational and technical education programs--estimated by Willingham and Findikyan at 62% of the total number of students rejected for transfer--an even higher percentage of transfer students would be entering the upper class levels of the four-year colleges and universities. Many observers of higher education practices are calling for such liberalization with initial steps being taken by the regional accrediting associations, in cooperation with the American Vocational Association and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, to accredit post-secondary school vocational and technical education programs.

TABLE 6

Percentage of Transfer Students Entering at Various Class Levels in 624 Senior Receiving Institutions Fall, 1970[5]

CLASS	PERCENT
Freshmen	16
Sophomore	35
Junior	42
Senior	7

[5] Sundeen and Goodale, op. cit.

B. Vocational and Technical Education Course Transfer Credit and CASE

While such accreditation might contribute to the resolution of the problem, a more realistic solution for both the short and long run might better be modeled on the program developed by the American Council on Education's Commission on Accreditation of Servicemen's Experience (CASE) for evaluating Armed Services education and training courses for suggested college credits. There appears to be considerable similarity between the Armed Services education and training activities and the vocational and technical education programs of two-year post-secondary institutions. CASE is currently studying the need for the evaluation of the vocational-technical service school programs at the junior college level for college credit transfer purposes. The Commission established a special committee during its May, 1972 meeting to explore this possibility and to report back to the Commission at its October 30, 1972 meeting. According to Dr. Cornelius P. Turner, executive director of CASE,

> "It seems quite likely that the Commission will undertake the evaluation of the vocational-technical courses offered by the Armed Forces of the United States in terms of terminal junior college credit. If approved by the Commission members, the project will get underway in 1973 and be completed in about a year's time"[6]

If the thesis of this proposition can be realized, hundreds of thousands of individuals who have been and are being denied college credit for so-called "non-academic" work in post-secondary vocational and technical institutions will be benefited. Precedents are already available, e.g.,

---

[6] In a memo from Cornelius P. Turner to Dr. W. Todd Furniss, American Council on Education, dated August 9, 1972; forwarded to Bernard Michael, executive director of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

a. Some 15 colleges, including Massachusetts Institute of Technology grant up to two years credit to graduates of the RCA Institute's courses in electronic technology. The University of Minnesota will award one credit hour toward a B.A. or A.A. for every 32 class hours spent in a control data course of the Control Data Institute. The longest such course, Computer Technology, takes 1,000 hours (at a cost of $2,650) and would entitle the student to 32 credit hours, about one year's academic work. The New York Institute of Technology, under special arrangements made with the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machinery Association, will award one year of college credit to individuals who have completed 5 year apprenticeships as tool and die makers.

b. South Carolina recently reported that great strides have been made in arranging for colleges and universities within, and in nearby states, to accept graduates of its 13 Technical Education Centers.[7] Lander College will accept students into a B.S. degree in Technical Education while Appalachian State University and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte will accept students into their Engineering Technology Programs. Coker College will accept graduates with an Associate Degree in the Business Division toward a B.S. in Administration. Clemson University accepts credits from an Associate Degree Engineering Program. Other institutions accepting transfer of particular courses on an individual basis are Georgia Tech and the University of South Carolina.

Acceptance of vocational and technical education post-secondary courses for transfer credit by colleges and universities is undoubtedly

---

[7] Addison Barker, "Transferring TEC Credits", Impact, South Carolina Technical Education Committee, Columbia, South Carolina, May, 1972.

a growing movement throughout the U.S. It will grow much more rapidly if the CASE program for Armed Services educational and training programs is expanded to become operational for civilian schools and programs.

Since the work of the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) is the basis for several major new directions suggested for consideration in this paper, it is appropriate to present some pertinent information concerning CASE's 1968 edition of "A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services."[8] This Guide contains a listing of collegiate credit recommendations for 8,811 formal service school training programs. It was financed by the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration, with the encouragement and assistance of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and the College Entrance Examination Board. The cooperation of hundreds of educators was enlisted in evaluating the many service school programs and courses. The Guide is utilized by college admissions officers in helping determine whether or not, and how much college credit is to be given for a specific service school program or course. Among the typical entries in the Guide is the following for two drafting courses offered by the Army:

1. General Drafting (Entry)
2. General Drafting

   Locations: Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Virginia;
   Engineer Training Center, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri

   Length: 9 weeks

   Objectives: To train enlisted personnel in general drafting details, cartographic, model making, and related drafting activities.

[8] Cornelius P. Turner, (ed), A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968

Instructions: Principles and techniques of drafting; projection theory; preparation of plans, elevations, and views; construction of buildings, bridges, and roads; methods of construction, computations, and materials used in construction work by blue print reading.

Credit recommendation, collegiate level:

4 semester hours in engineering drafting for each course."[9]

A number of service school course recommendations listed in the Guide carry the following type of credit recommendation where the evaluators have been unable to develop specific collegiate parallels:

> This course is technical and vocational in nature. Credit in (ed; e.g., automotive repair) on the basis of demonstrated skills and/or institutional examinations.

Other recommendations suggest credit at a specific college level, or credit for classwork but an examination to determine amount of credit to be provided for laboratory work, etc.

Upon request from civilian education institutions, CASE will provide credit recommendations and other information concerning military educational experiences, USAFI correspondence courses, the GED Testing Program, and the College-Level Examination Program.

The procedure adopted by CASE in evaluating the service school experience for undergraduate college credit involves selection of three civilian educators, qualified at the level of instruction and in the fields of learning concerned. The names of consultants are obtained from officials of institutions of higher learning, state departments of education, city school systems, and national educational and professional associations.

---

[9]Cornelius Turner, op. cit. (page 178).

It should be noted that CASE was established in 1945 by the American Council on Education at the request of civilian educational institutions and the regional accrediting associations, "as the one national agency to evaluate military educational programs and to assist institutions by providing recommendations for the granting of credit for such experiences."[10] Additional facets of CASE programs and services are discussed in later sections of this paper.

C. Meaningfulness of Grades in the Transfer Process

Researchers are also calling for liberalization of policies and practices to lower the numbers of transfer applicants reported as rejected in 1966 by Willingham and Findikyan because of less than a C grade average. They point out that this rate represents approximately 100,000 students being denied continuing higher education on the very questionable assumption that a C- grade in one college is the equivalent of a C- grade in any other college.

> "This form of credentialism suggests much greater uniformity in grading standards and stability in academic performance than available evidence supports."[11]

Since the previous college grade average has been credited as the principal single gatekeeper for admitting or rejecting transfer students, according to all the researchers in this field, a student who leaves one college with a poor academic record and attempts to enroll in another college years later, will be haunted by this earlier record despite any

---

[10] Granting Credit for Service School Training, Bulletin Number 8, Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., September, 1968.

[11] Willingham and Findikyan, op. cit.

personal, motivational, and intellectual changes resulting from experience and maturation. Dr. Astin points out, however, that while previous grades are important predictors of success in college, scores on tests of academic ability are also major predictors![12] Other factors he reports as being significant are:

a. Having high aspirations for acquiring a degree

b. Financing one's college education through aid from parents, scholarships or personal savings

c. Not being employed during the school year.

Other than the tests, there is little evidence that colleges take Astin's list of other factors into account when considering an applicant for transfer.

In April, 1971, a survey was conducted of the grading policies of the 1,696 member institutions of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACROA)[13]. It was found that there is a substantial move to modify traditional grading policies with "pass-fail", or "credit-no credit", as the most common illustration of this trend. However, specific practices vary:

Pass-Fail limited to elective courses	55% of institutions
Quality of work represented by "pass":	
"D" grade or above	52% of institutions
"C" grade or above	33% of institutions

Among the other findings were:

1. An almost even split among institutions between averaging the grades for a course which was failed the first time and passed

---

[12] Alexander W. Astin, College Dropouts: A National Profile, American Council on Education, February, 1972.

[13] The AACROA Survey of Grading Policies in Member Institutions, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C., 1971.

when repeated (40%), and replacing the "fail" grade with the "pass" grade (54%).

2. One-fourth to one-third of the institutions have not yet developed admissions policies for accepting non-traditional grades on a transfer applicant's transcript:
   a. Of those with policies, the majority appeared to be quite liberal even if all the grades were non-traditional, although 40% would seek further evidence of the quality of performance. (Ed. note: In one case brought to my attention, a transfer student had to write 52 letters -- including followups -- to instructors at her previous institution in order to obtain evidence of the quality of her performance in the courses she was seeking to transfer.)
3. More than one-third of the institutions accept credit without question of non-traditional grades, where some, but not all of the grades on the transcript are of this type:
   a. 9% place a limit on the number of such credits which will be accepted.
   b. In calculating grade point averages--<u>the most common criteria for admission of transfer students</u> (ed. note: underlined statement is a direct quote)--44% of the institutions disregard non-traditional grades, 21% request further information, and 7% assign such grades an arbitrary value.

The report arrives at two important conclusions. One is that the rate of major changes in grading systems is accelerating, with such changes

occurring during the last year in one-third of the responding institutions. The second conclusion is that while 41% of the institutions believe their grading systems will become less traditional in the near future, 56% expect their current practices to be maintained.

This last statement is somewhat surprising considering the on-going ferment concerning grading policies. For example, the University of Minnesota reported, early in May, 1972, it will initiate a new grading system next fall eliminating "F" grades. Under this system, a student's official transcript will record only the work he has completed satisfactorily and for which he has received credit.[14] If a student transfers from Minnesota (and other colleges which also do not show failed courses on the transcript), the receiving institution will be foiled if it normally considers failed courses in the grade-point averaging process.

Another 1971 study of college grading practices was concerned with the purposes, uses, and impact of grading rather than describing the practices.[15] The author, Jonathan R. Warren, raises some interesting questions; e.g.,

What are the purposes of grades?

Are the purposes worthwhile?

If so, are they well served?

Are the frequent criticisms of grades justified?

Isn't grading being confused with the process of evaluation and being substituted for it?

---

[14] Higher Education and National Affairs, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1972, (page 7).

[15] Jonathan R. Warren, College Grading Practices: An Overview, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., Report No. 9, March, 1971.

He goes on to point out that grades, which exercise a substantial influence on decisions about who shall be admitted to institutions of higher education, has questionable rationale for justification.

> "Teachers prefer students whom teachers before them have preferred. But whether the elements of performance that determine teacher preferences coincide substantially with the elements of performance on which decisions about continued education should be based is a question that has never been examined."[16]

Warren examines other rationales for the use of grades; e.g., that they are an extremely useful and equitable mechanism for sorting people according to academic merit and much to be preferred for distributing society's rewards than is parental, social and economic status. On the other hand, he points out:

> "the academic achievement that grades reflect is a somewhat circumscribed kind of performance more readily obtained by members of higher social and economic classes than by those of other classes. Yet education is also the primary path to higher social and economic status. Consequently, educational selection based on previous performance offers the opportunity for further development to those already most highly developed and increases the gap between the lower and upper segments of the population with respect to whatever benefits education provides."[17]

In summary, Warren proposes that a variety of college grading and evaluation systems are needed for different internal purposes, but that satisfactory completion of a course at a previous institution is all that the receiving institution needs to know when receiving the transfer applicant's transcript. In connection with this novel and interesting proposition, it also would be intriguing to explore the entire philosophy of the lockstep-course syndrome in most of higher education. In light of

---

[16] Jonathan Warren, ibid.

[17] Jonathan Warren, ibid-

emerging new concepts of how education should be presented; e.g., in interdisciplinary modules rather than in specific courses, the present college transfer policies and practices of traditionally oriented institutions of higher education simply would not be applicable if such colleges were selected by students transferring from non-traditional programs. Colleges and universities are having a difficult enough time now with accepting non-traditional grading systems for transfer. Warren's suggestion of merely requiring satisfactory completion of a course for transfer acceptance, according to some higher education reformers, could conceivably become the new basic policy sufficiently flexible and viable to embrace both traditional and future modes of higher education practices.

On the other hand, many authorities question the desirability of a national policy of using "satisfactory" as a recognized grade for courses being considered for transfer. Dr. Millard, Education Commission of the States, comments:

> "I am not sure that this either solves or gets at the problem and I am afraid it would have the tendency to reinforce the quantitative block unit conception of education which defines an educated person at 120 hours. This, to my way of thinking, is the most serious problem with so-called credit bank types of concepts and solutions. It seems to me that more and more we are going to have to move towards an achievement level rather than an accumulation of credit unit concept of educational attainment. If this is the case, then the CLEP approch or at least the definition of level of achievement and the development of appropriate testing means to verify this is considerably more important than engaging in the fantasy that all courses are equal. Even in an achievement approach, it will be necessary to differentiate between levels of mastery and if this is the case then something similar to a grading system can hardly be done away with.[18]

[18] In a letter dated September 11, 1972 to Bernard Michael, executive director, Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

The author of this paper believes that Millard's reservations, as well as those of other commentators, could be resolved by Warren in his proposal for differentiated grading systems for internal and external purposes.

D. Role of Regional Accrediting Agencies

Almost as important as is an acceptable grade average for a college student seeking transfer to another college or university is that his courses were taken at an accredited institution of higher education. Students attempting to transfer from non-accredited institutions (even though the institution may be in the process of becoming accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations) may find the receiving institution unwilling to accept any courses for credit, may be required to have a higher grade average than students transferring from accredited institutions, or may have to take qualifying examinations for some or all the courses submitted for transfer credit. These conditions, of course, are all in addition to other transfer policies and practices of the receiving institution.

The policies of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools -- the regional accrediting association for institutions in Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the Canal Zone -- are quite similar to those of the other five regional associations for the United States. Examination of the Middle States policies and procedures relating to higher education institutions, reveals that the transfer process has received some attention. For example, in discussing two year college programs in the Policies and Procedures Handbook of its Commission on Higher Education,

transfer programs are considered primarily in terms of the student's needs and the college's mission, rather than any requirements of a senior institution to which the graduate might transfer. It is appropriate to quote selected excerpts in light of attempts to establish core curricula which might be acceptable for transfer by four-year institutions.

> "A two year college which offers transfer programs should build them in the light of its own educational philosophy. The task in transfer curricula is to give the student a thorough introduction to the primary areas of liberal education. It cannot and ought not attempt to match point by point the plan of any four year institution.
>
> "Technical and professional curricula present the dilemma of how much time to divert from specialized subjects to general or liberal education. The cue to a decision lies in each institution's own objectives. If they are strictly vocational, they imply concentration on producing a higher technical proficiency than a divided course can do in the same length of time, or doing so more quickly. If they encompass intellectual breadth and personal enrichment as well as practical training, they pose an acute issue for the two year college. It obviously has to produce competent specialists, but in meeting this commitment it necessarily accepts also the responsibilities for broader individual development common to all higher education. The problem is how to do both.
>
> "The double aim requires a calculated division of time, with an allotment to liberal subjects proportionate to the place general education occupies in the college's objectives. Let it be generous enough to accomplish its purpose. What seems a loss in the curtailment of technical instruction may prove a gain if necessity compels the faculty to discover ways to use their classroom time more productively and to emphasize principles more than procedures.
>
> "What kinds of courses should be counted as general education in a technical curriculum? Those which have the best chance of fulfilling its aims for the student, which should be to draw him into important new areas of intellectual experience, to increase awareness of his cultural heritage, and to prepare him to make sound judgments outside as well as within his specialized field. Professional usefulness should therefore not be the only ground on which courses are selected, nor should those whose purpose is to develop communication

and computation skills, necessary as these are, be listed among them. The general education sequence should be designed with an eye to its true intent and the distinctive contribution it may make to the total intellectual growth of each student.[19]

The only specific reference to transfer students as such is contained in the section of the Handbook titled, Transfer Applicants from Unaccredited Colleges, as follows:

"The basic fact an admissions committee needs to keep in mind in dealing with applicants for transfer from students who have done their previous work in unaccredited institutions is that the regional associations evaluate and accredit a college, not the students who are enrolled there. Accreditation by the regional commissions affords reasons for confidence in the clarity of an institution's purposes, in the appropriateness of its resources and plans for carrying out those purposes, and in its practical effectiveness in accomplishing its goals, so far as these things can be judged. Accreditation can not possibly mean that every student in an institution is qualified for transfer, even in courses much like the ones he has been taking. Furthermore, as every experienced observer knows, many an excellent student chooses to go or is able to go only to a new or unknown institution which lacks regional accreditation. And there are a hundred different reasons why the institution may lack accreditation.

"A college should by no means exclude transfer applicants from unaccredited institutions. But it takes more effort to deal with them. Among other things, the unaccredited institution should be asked for a catalog covering the years when the student was there. Examine that catalog closely, not just for the description of the courses he has taken but for what it says about the faculty and the library. In examining those two elements, take careful account of the level of the work the student was doing there, and of the level of the institution itself -- whether junior college, senior college, etc. Make a personal inquiry to the dean of that college about the student, asking for a clear-cut recommendation or write to the admissions officer of a nearby institution you know, and ask him what his admissions committee does with applicants from that institution."[20]

---

[19] Polices and Procedures Handbook, (Newark, N. J. Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; June, 1971).

[20] Ibid

This statement of policy is not particularly encouraging to a student who has attended an institution which lacks accreditation for any of "a hundred different reasons!"

Considering the ever-increasing numbers of college transfer students seeking transfer from accredited institutions, those enrolled in independent programs of study, and those obtaining credit through the College-Level Examination Program and other external degree examination programs, it would appear appropriate for the Middle States and other regional accrediting associations to adopt policies and practices relating to such students -- at least for those from accredited institutions. Particularly since the Commission has established as a basic policy in considering an institution for accreditation that for entering freshmen students it:

> "require for admission the completion of not less than an appropriate secondary school curriculum or satisfactory evidence of equivalent educational achievement."[21]

Why then should the Commission not develop some policies and practices concerning admissions of transfer students. As a suggestion, the Commission might adopt a policy whereby a student who has successfully completed at least one year of college study at an accredited institution need not be required to submit a high school transcript to a receiving college or university. On the surface, this suggested policy appears to be of small consequence. However, in actual practice, it would eliminate considerable paperwork on the part of the transfer student, the receiving institution, and the high school. In addition, it would eliminate a completely irrational practice!

---

[21] Ibid

In conversation with Dr. Robert Kirkwood, executive director of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, the author of this paper was assured that the Federation is planning to become involved in the transfer problem and of its interest in participating in any national effort to resolve the major problems and irrational policies and practices. This must be viewed as a most hopeful "sign of the times."

E. Student Mobility and Tuition Costs

Among the findings of major impact to national policy relating to higher education were the primary reasons students transferred to the institutions they selected as perceived by the College Personnel Administrators, as reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Primary Reasons Transfer Students Selected Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education as Perceived by 624 College Personnel Administrators Fall, 1970[22]

REASONS	NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS
Proximity to home	122
Low cost	117
Academic reputation	106
Unique curricular program	93
Physical facilities	51
Counselor recommendation	44
Minimum admissions requirements	34
Religious emphasis	16
Other	41
TOTAL	624

[22] Sundeen and Goodale, op. cit.

It is interesting to note that minimum admissions requirements were cited by only 5% of the respondents, while almost 40% attributed the inter-related reasons of proximity to home and low cost of attendance as reasons for selecting transfer institutions. Academic reputation of an institution accounted for only 17% of the reasons and unique curricular program for approximately 15%. Closely related to the cost considerations were three other findings of this study, that:

1. Over 70% of the students transferred to public liberal arts colleges or universities
2. Over 14% of the students were married
3. Over 3% of the students were from minority groups.

Since cost of attending college is obviously a major consideration to over 2/3 of the students transferring from one college to another, the finding of Willingham and Findikyan that only 14% of the transfer students receive financial aid, as compared to 33% of the freshmen entering college for the first time is very intriguing. It appears that transfer students are being discriminated against in one more area of the transfer process -- financial aid. Other researchers have commented on this fact and have concluded that a number of students accepted for transfer by colleges cannot attend because of lack of financial assistance, even though there is no hard data available on this point. It is believed, however, that as colleges and universities discover that a growing percentage of their student bodies are transfer students, more financial aid will be made available for such students. There also appears to be a more generous policy applied to upperclassmen by lending institutions under the Federally insured student loan programs. It is reported that many banks often deny loans to first year students on the theory that they represent the

greatest number of problems to banks because of a higher percentage of dropouts among freshmen; these same banks will welcome applications from upperclassmen.

Probably the most important data concerning the national dimensions of the student transfer problem -- and which make the Willingham and Findikyan and the Sundeen and Goodale reports even more significant than when first published -- relates to the mobility patterns of transfer students as reported by the U.S. Office of Education in its 1968 study. An in-depth review of the data collected in that study was published in 1971 by Calvert, Drews and Wade.[23] Some of their findings are discussed below.

Of the 6,711,158 students enrolled in resident programs creditable to a bachelor's or higher degree, the great bulk (5,743,270) are at the undergraduate level, with 84% enrolling in their home states. Among all the undergraduates, 8.1% (465,104) were new transfer students -- up from 7.5% in 1963. Of all the transfer students, 89% in public institutions transferred to other public institutions in their home state, while 68% of the transfer students from private institutions in their home state transferred to either public or private institutions in that state. These findings support the Willingham and Findikyan's report which showed a 54% increase in transfer students between 1961 and 1966, and predictions of increasing growth in this direction.

> "In 1961 for every transfer student entering a four-year institution there were about 5 freshmen. In 1966 the ratio was roughly 1 to 4. Our respondents estimate that

---

[23] R. Calvert, Jr., T. H. Drews, and George H. Wade, "College Student Migration: A Review of 1968 Data and Implications", College and University, Fall, 1971, Volume 47, Number 1, Page 46 (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C.)

> transfers will increase by 75% during the next five year period, bringing the ratio to about 1 to 3 by 1971. In a large number of institutions the ratio is already 1 to 1, or close to it."[24]

They also support Sundeen and Goodale's findings that the major reasons students select their transfer college are related to lower costs of attendance, which translates into public institutions in their home states. In this respect, transfer students are no different than entering freshmen.

Calvert, et al attach considerable import to their findings concerning students leaving their home states to attend college in another state. While the decrease between 1962 and 1968 was only 2% for all undergraduate students, when translated into absolute figures, this means that 134,000 fewer students left their states in 1968 than left in 1963. This figure is larger than the total enrollment of higher education in each of 37 states in the U.S. Furthermore, two-year colleges which enrolled 19.2% of all students in 1968 were up 4.4% since 1963, with only 5% of their students from out-of-state.

Local and state-wide studies support the national findings to a remarkable degree. Beardslee reported that 44% of all Oakland University, Michigan, junior and senior students entering Oakland University in 1969 were transfer students, and estimated that within a short time over half the degrees awarded by the University would be to students who had started their higher education in another college.[25] In a much broader study of transfer students in Illinois[26], it was found that 64% of the 30,000 transfer students in 1968 came from Illinois public and private junior and

---

[24] Willingham and Findikyan, op. cit.

[25] David C. Beardslee, "Transfer Entrants", Unpublished memorandum, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, 1969.

[26] Council on Articulation, Illinois Conference on Higher Education, Performance of Transfer Students Within Illinois Institutions of Higher Education, November, 1971.

senior institutions. Of further interest are the findings that:

1. Transfer students do not necessarily leave their last institution as the result of academic difficulties.

2. Out-of-state transfer students to Illinois comprise 25% of the transfer population.

3. There is a net loss of transfer students by private institutions.

With respect to this latter point, Calvert, et al, in their study, reported that percentages of all students enrolled in higher education in private institutions as compared to public institutions have dropped sharply from 42.5% in 1958 to 30% in 1968. Again, the major reason given for most transfer students enrolling in public colleges and universities in their home states is concerned with lower costs than in private institutions either within their state or in other states.

The decreasing number of students transferring to out-of-state institutions -- even public institutions -- is being exacerbated by deliberate policies of state legislatures and higher education boards in assigning quotas for out-of-state students, charging out-of-state residents much higher costs than are applied to native students, and even establishing higher standards for admission of students. A number of commentators (and students) consider such policies as discriminatory and unconstitutional. However, according to William E. Crawford, an authority on this subject, courts have consistently held that colleges and universities within a state can establish different admissions requirements and fees for out-of-state residents. He further believes that "The change in voting age should have no direct effect on residence qualifications unless considerably more legislative change is in the offing.

I do not believe the pressure of Federal funds in the financing of state universities furnishes a basis in law for the change in non-residency practices.[27] He does agree, however, that Federal agencies controlling such funds could exert their authority to require different practices. Such an effort would be discretionary and under the legislative authority possessed by the agencies.

Crawford may have to revise his opinion on this matter in light of recent state and federal court decisions reported in a study conducted for the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges by Dr. Robert F. Carbone, dean of the School of Education, University of Maryland.[28] While there is as yet no clear-cut decision on a national level, Dr. Carbone's study finds that a number of courts are ruling that if a student is allowed to vote in a state, he or she must also in effect, be considered a resident for other purposes, including payment of tuition. Dr. Carbone also found that state colleges and universities stand to lose between $250 and $300 million per year if non-resident differential tuition payments are eliminated. Some observers believe that this amount of money, when divided by the 50 states and the colleges within those states, is not a significant source of revenue to any single institution.

They believe that the universally higher tuition rates for out-of-state residents attempting to transfer into a public institution in another state are being used as a deterrant,[29] and if challenged in the higher federal courts as a form of discrimination, will be ruled unconstitutional.

---

[27]William E. Crawford, "Residency and the Resident--What Is It and Who Is He?", College and University, Summer, 1971, Vol. 46, No. 4, p. 668.

[28]Robert F. Carbone, Voting Rights and the Nonresident Student (Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grand Colleges, 1972).

[29]John Lombardi, "Tuition...and the Open Door", Junior College Journal, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., May, 1972.

It is conceivable that an out-of-state student in a Southern black college could invoke the Federal laws concerning anti-segregation and anti-discrimination by an organization engaged in inter-state commerce!

Among the important implications of the rapidly decreasing mobility of all students is the change in the student body on the campuses of our nation. Leaders in higher education have encouraged geographical diversity because they claimed it produced a varied student body which in itself contributed to the learning process. However, the admissions requirements of most colleges, while aimed at diversity, in reality created a homogeneous student body most of whom were white, lived in suburbia, and held very similar economic, social and cultural values. However, as greater numbers of students enroll in public colleges in their home states and as public colleges account for an ever-increasing proportion of enrolled college students, there is bound to be a greater diversity of cultural values represented in each institution, and possibly a much greater impact on the learning process than that created by geographical diversity alone. As this change takes place, so invevitably must the mission of institutions of higher education change; i.e., to a concern for providing an education for all those who desire it. Societal needs rather than institutional prerogatives will become the imperative for effecting reforms in many of the admissions policies and practices of colleges and universities if our nation is to retain a high degree of mobility for its people and access to higher education for all who seek it whenever and wherever they may be.

F. Significance of Decreasing Freshmen Enrollments

Insistent pressures for greater and easier access to higher education is already evidenced by the numbers of students engaged in non-traditional forms of higher education study and obtention of college degrees as discussed in later sections of this paper. As colleges and universities respond to these pressures, admissions policies and practices concerning transfer of undergraduate courses and credits will inevitably change from being restrictive and selective for the chosen "elite" to the welcome, open-door for all who wish to enter. The gates will open wide and precipitously much sooner than most college administrators foresee, as the "external degree" and the university-without-walls "independent contract" concepts become recognized options to class attendance for obtaining a higher education and a degree; and the transfer student from such programs, as well as from other colleges, becomes a major segment of the collegiate student body during this coming decade.

That a decline in the enrollment of entering freshmen in all colleges and universities will--as a matter of fact, already is--taking place comes as a shock to most college administrators. Conventional wisdom of the 1960's had predicted ever increasing enrollments of entering freshmen into college indefinitely into the future. Based on these predictions, new junior and community colleges have been built and opened at the rate of almost one per week throughout the U.S. in recent years, and others have added facilities for anticipated hordes of entering students. But the enrollments in 1971 and 1972 of entering freshmen has slowed down to such an extent as to cause real anxiety by college administrators,

particularly those responsible for junior and community colleges, according to a recent ERIC report.[30] Quoting several administrators, Lombardi found:

> "Enrollment projections for next year should be reduced . . . the days of annual student enrollment expansion are over."
>
> "Whatever the reasons (for the enrollment sag) the phenomenon is here."

The study goes on to state that more than two-thirds of the 30 northern California junior college presidents reported, "either a decline in actual enrollment or falling short of estimates." In 46 Illinois colleges the rate of growth slipped from 19.6% in 1970 to 12.3% in 1971. The headcount rate of growth also declined from 14.8% to 10.4%. The huge Los Angeles Unified District experienced a drop of 13,000 instead of a projected increase of 18,000 entering students in 1972, the third consecutive year of decreases. New York University recently predicted there would be a drop in its undergraduate arts and sciences divisions of approximately 1,300 equivalent full-time students within the next few years.[31]

There is some evidence that the boom years are over for higher education according to a report in the U.S. News and World Report of September 4, 1972. The report went so far as to state that:

> "Colleges are beginning to lower admission standards to lure larger numbers of students. Many are beefing up recruiting staffs for next year."[32]

---

[30] John Lombardi, "Moratorium on New Junior Colleges", ERIC Junior College Research Review, Volume 6, No. 8, May 1972, University of California, Los Angeles.

[31] Task Force Bids N.Y.U. Drop Some Programs and Cut Faculty, New York Times May 23, 1972.

[32] 300,000 College Vacancies - Why," U.S. News and World Report, September 4, 1972 (pp. 36-38).

While some colleges are finding themselves in a crisis situation with decreasing enrollments, it is not the elite colleges or the great state universities. The pinch is felt mostly by the small independent institutions. Commenting on this situation, Rev. Paul C. Reinert, chairman of the 800-member Association of American Colleges, believes that public institutions have overexpanded themselves in some parts of each state while the private sector remains underenrolled.[33] On the other hand, many public, four year institutions are losing students to two-year community colleges that are cheaper and closer to home.[34]

The story of declining enrollments in colleges is being carried in other popular magazines. A Michigan educator is quoted in Kiplinger's Changing Times as saying, "Next fall's freshmen class could well be the smallest in years among Michigan's state colleges and universities."[35] And Parade magazine of May 21, 1972, contained an article headed, "Wanted: Transfer Students", with the following eye-opening paragraph:

> "Only a few years ago transfer students found difficulty in entering most colleges and universities. But today, about half of any entering college class can be expected to drop out before graduation. Moreover, schools are hard-pressed financially. They welcome transfer students to fill the empty seats and replenish the tuition coffers."[36]

College administrators ascribe five major factors for the current decline in enrollments, according to the U.S. News and World Report previously cited.:

1. A smaller pool of 18-year olds in the country; the big crop of babies born after World War II has passed through college

---

[33] Ibid

[34] Ibid

[35] "Getting Into College These Days", Changing Times, Washington, D.C., May, 1972.

[36] "Wanted-Transfer Students", Parade, May 21, 1972, page 18.

2. Reduced pressure from the military draft, resulting in fewer young men going to college to obtain deferments

3. Rising costs of a college education

4. A questioning of the value of a college education as compared to the benefits of shorter, less expensive vocational training

5. Deferring entrance into, or completion, of college in favor of travel or work experience

While the rate of increase in college enrollments may be decreasing dramatically, the number of college students is still expected to increase during the 1970's. The estimates presented in Table 8 make it clear that our nation is still committed to making college education available for more and more people.

TABLE 8

College Enrollments
1965-1979

Students Registered	1965 (000)	1972 (est;000)	1979 (est;000)	Percentage Increase 1965-1972	Increase 1972-1979
4-Year Colleges	4,685	7,036	8,948	50	27
2-Year Colleges	841	1,945	2,919	131	50
TOTAL	5,526	8,981	11,867	63	32

Source: U.S. Office of Education as reported in U.S. News and World Report, September 4, 1972

The continued expected increase in college enrollments during the coming years is reassuring to many higher education teachers and officials. However, there is no assurance that campus and classroom life will not undergo radical change because of the change in student characteristics. Most authorities are convinced that the college student body of the

next decades will be comprised of a majority of transfer students -- older students, part-time students, returning college dropouts, graduates of two-year colleges, and students engaged in various types of independent study leading to external higher education degrees. And as Dr. Millard points out,

> "transfer students not only are but will become more and more important to the very existence, one might almost say, of many four year institutions... ...migration of students in and out of institutions should in fact be encouraged, and whether encouraged or not, may well be a major part of the pattern in the future. If this is the case then it is clear that the four year institutions who do not liberalize their programs are in for serious trouble."[37]

But increases in student numbers alone will not solve the financial plight or problems so long endemic to most colleges and universities. More and more, higher education is looking to the federal government for monies. Current federal support to universities and colleges, exclusive of loans, continues to increase both in current and constant dollars. The $3.4 billion of fiscal 1971 was 8% higher than in 1970, and will certainly be exceeded when the Education Amendments Act of 1972 finally becomes law. It is interesting to note that in 1971 six federal agencies alone sponsored academic activities in colleges amounting to more than $100 million each.[38]

There is no question that society's demand for greater access and more options to higher education credentials by greater numbers of individuals is converging at this moment in time with the needs of colleges and universities for more students and money. This merger of interests, more than any other force, will probably be the catalyst in

---

[37] Op. cit., letter of September 11, 1972 to Bernard Michael.

[38] Federal Support to Universities, Colleges and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1971, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

the very near future for achieving rationality, simplification, articulation and perhaps, even some standardization of the admissions policies and practices for college transfer students. The potential of these sheer numbers will no longer permit institutions of higher education to afford the luxury or prerogative of cavalier treatment of these students; instead the institutions will soon find themselves engaged in efforts to recruit and retain them. What direction these efforts may take is examined in the remainder of this paper.

CHAPTER 3

ARTICULATION BETWEEN JUNIOR AND SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

As the responsibility for lower-division education has shifted more and more to the nation's junior and community colleges (currently numbering some 900 public and 200 private institutions with a total enrollment of 2,680,702 -- approximately 25% of the total undergraduate students[1]) the need for systematically providing for the transfer of students from junior to senior institutions was recognized as an imperative as early as 1958. That year the American Association of Junior Colleges, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and the Association of American Colleges formed the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges. The Committee, recognizing the need for additional data upon which some sound guidelines could be established, persuaded the U.S. Office of Education and the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley to sponsor a study conducted by Knoell and Medsker of students transferring from junior to senior colleges.[2] On the basis of that study, t tentative guidelines for the articulation of junior and senior college programs, which had been drafted by the Joint Committee, were examined and field tested. This experience resulted in a document published by the American Council on Education titled, Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges.[3]

[1]Official estimate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges as of October, 1971.

[2]Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student, The American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1965.

[3]James H. Nelson (editor), Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1966.

While a number of the suggested guidelines have been adopted by colleges, researchers are agreed that much work still needs to be done before articulation between the junior and senior institutions of higher education can be said to have become a reality. According to Kintzer, articulation is defined as:

> "A process which, at least, provides a continuous flow of students from grade level to grade level and from school to school. Implicit in this process is the need to systematize the activities influencing student progress. In its broadest definition, articulation also refers to the interrelationships between schools and colleges, quasi-educational institutions, and other community organizations -- all activities that affect the movement of the students.
>
> "Articulation can also be described as an attitude -- the reactions of personnel responsible for student progress."[4]

He goes on to point out that (in 1970):

> "Plans are noted in scattered areas of the country, but usually in single districts or institutions rather than in regions or states where the pressure is greatest. Only a handful of states have developed plans for effective transfer."[5]

A year later, Kintzer again reported little improvement in the great majority of states in coordinating transfer course-credit policies. "There is still a lack of uniformity among senior colleges regarding the number and type of required lower division courses and the number of credits assigned specific courses . . . ." And these are but some of the many technical problems confronting community college relationships with senior institutions, he stated.[6]

---

[4]Frederick C. Kintzer, Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation, Topical Paper Number 15, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California at Los Angeles, 1970.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Frederick C. Kintzer, "Focusing on Transfer-A New Awareness", Meeting of the Advisory Council for the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, University of California, Los Angeles, December 8, 1971

The diversity and extent of these problems in just one state, Tennessee, is dramatically illustrated in Appendix B. Some of the problems of articulation in other states are discussed in Appendix C.[7]

The nitty-gritty of articulation problems, however, is best illustrated by the substance of the articulation agreements themselves. Following are excerpts from agreements between 8 Los Angeles junior colleges and 3 senior colleges in California. Note that the same 8 junior colleges are involved, and the fantastic amount of work which these junior colleges must undertake in arranging the agreements for just one single program of studies in the lower division of the senior college. The program selected for illustration is Biology. As an aside note, while the work of the admissions offices of the four-year colleges in accepting the junior colleges courses for credit is considerably simplified by these agreements, they still must engage in a great deal of clerical effort in just making sure the appropriate courses are being transferred for specific course exemption and degree credit.

Example 1:[8]

California State College at Los Angeles Required Course	Equivalent Los Angeles Community College Courses
1. Competence in Mathematics through Mathematics 103 (Algebra and Trigonometry) as shown by satisfactory performance in mathematics placement examination.	
2. Biology 100 A B C	2. Biology 6-7 or Zoology 1-2 and Botany 1 or 2 (Biology 3 with 24 acceptable for 100 A B)
3. Chemistry 100 A B C	3. Chemistry 1-2

[7]Also see discussion of articulation problems between 4-year institutions and vocational and technical post-secondary institutions in Section 2 of this report.

[8]1971 Articulation Agreements, California State College at Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community Colleges, Office of School and College Relations, Los Angeles.

3. Chemistry 100 A B C	3. Chemistry 1-2
4. Physics 101-102	4. Physics 6-7
5. Botany 220	5. Botany 2
6. Electives (12 units)	6. Electives (8 units): Additional coures with at least one from each of the following groups: a. Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics 5, 6, 7 or 8 b. Geology, Meteorology, Climatology, Microbiology 1

Example 2:[9]

San Fernando Valley State College	Equivalent Los Angeles Community College Courses
1. Chemistry 101-102 or Chemistry 103-104	1. Chemistry 1-2
2. Biology 101 or Biology 150-150L-151-151L	2. Biology 3, Zoology 1-2 or Botany 1-2
3. Biology 211-212 Biology 281	3. Anatomy 1 with (Physcology 1 or 3 or Zoology 6)

Example 3:[10]

The University of California, Los Angeles Courses	Equivalent Los Angeles Community College Courses
1. Biology 2	1. Biology 1, 2, 23, 24
2. Biology 2 (plus Laboratory)	2. Biology 3
3. Biology 1 A B	3. Biology 6-7, 9
4. Biology 21	4. Biology 10, 8, 13, 20, 23, 24, 25, 41

[9] 1971-1973 Articulation Agreements, San Fernando Valley State College and the Los Angeles Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community Colleges, Office of School and College Relations, Los Angeles.

[10] 1971-1972 Articulation Agreements, The University of California, Los Angeles, and The Los Angeles Community Colleges, Los Angeles Community Colleges, Office of School and College Relations, Los Angeles.

For one of the most complete current discussions of the pros and cons of the problems of articulation between two and four year colleges and universities, we are indebted to Dr. Warren Willingham, a well-known researcher in this field.[11] The primary purpose of his recent report was to review the literature concerning research and developments pertaining to the problems of:

curriculum articulation

guidance services and orientation programs for the transfer student

admissions procedures

academic standards

credit transfer

access - retention characteristics of the transfer student

financial aid needs

space

articulation procedures

Willingham's discussion of the "core curriculum" concept is a good example of the thoroughness he devotes to each of the above problems. He acknowledges the attraction of developing a core curriculum in general education which could be offered by junior and community colleges as leading to an AA degree for automatic acceptance by senior colleges. He points out that this is consistent with the suggestion of the Carnegie Commission that students in all colleges be awarded the AA degree after successful completion of the lower division, and that the AA degree could thus become the common currency whereby all students start the upper division with a clean slate. However, there are two problems.

[11] Warren W. Willingham, The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division (Washington, D.C.; American Association for Higher Education, July, 1972).

> "Mere administrative adoption of the AA degree can sabotage educational continuity in the long run because it creates a clean break that would permit junior and senior colleges to go their separate ways. Present lack of discipline articulation between secondary and higher education belies the adequacy of that solution. Furthermore, training in specialized fields must span the upper and lower division. There is no good substitute for comprehensive and practical principles of curriculum articulation. Adoption of a prescribed core curriculum is a good principle upon which to initiate sound statewide articulation, but it seems important to recognize that it is only a start."[12]

While Willingham found the degree of adherence by many institutions to the recommended guidelines of the Joint Committee indifferent at best, he was able to report,

> "There are ample signs of increasing flexibility and cooperation between community colleges and 4-year institutions. Everything considered, the future of transfer articulation can only be described as optimistic."[13]

Willingham cites three main reasons why the movement of students from junior to senior colleges and universities must be articulated.

> "One is the critical relationship to the organization of higher education. Smooth transfer from 2- to 4-year institutions is a basic requirement for the hierarchical model in which community colleges serve to expand educational opportunity. A second reason is the growing magnitude of transfer admissions. Rough estimates indicate that one transfer student enters a senior institution for every three freshmen; of these transfers over half come from 2-year institutions. A third reason is the fact that transfer admissions includes a number of unique problems, quite different from freshmen admissions."[14]

In view of the importance Willingham attaches to the need for articulation, the problems involved (see Appendices B and C), the little progress being made in resolving these problems on a voluntary basis, and the long-range solutions recommended, his optimism is most encouraging, if not

---

[12] Willingham, ibid (p. 17).
[13] Willingham, ibid (p. 48).
[14] Willingham, ibid (p. 43).

entirely convincing. Particularly since Kintzer reports a growing trend toward legislatively mandated articulation agreements. His Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation,[15] summarizing articulation efforts in all of the fifty states, is the first phase of a three-stage research project scheduled for completion by September, 1973. Funded by the Esso Education Foundation, the project is titled, "Evaluation and Application of Community College Transfer Credits and Courses by Senior Colleges and Universities in All Fifty States." Excerpts of his findings in Stage 1 are contained in Appendix C of this paper. Stage 2 of the project will investigate student attitudes and report specific transfer problems. Stage 3 will provide bases for aiding statewide and regional articulation planning.

In his December 8, 1971 report[16] Kintzer noted the growing trend toward legally mandated articulation agreements by state agencies.

> "There is increasing evidence that the decade will bring greater involvement and control of junior-senior college articulation by state agencies. In most of the fifty states, some type of state-wide articulation authority -- some voluntary and relatively informal, other mandated, by legislation -- is working on systematizing policies. It is hoped that voluntary and cooperative efforts will, wherever possible, reverse the trend toward mandated articulation agreement."

With 70% of the collegiate population in public institutions of higher education, with higher education consuming a very large share of total state expenditures, and with voluntary articulation action between the junior and senior colleges within any state moving at a snail's pace

---

[15] Kintzer, "A Nationwide Pilot Study ... op. cit.

[16] Kintzer, "Focusing on Transfer - A New Awareness, op. cit.

if at all, mandated articulation by appropriate state agencies is almost a foregone conclusion, if such agreements are indeed the answer to the problems of the transfer student. However, even this is highly debatable. It is believed that other solutions must be found to provide more realistic bases for achieving the desired and needed articulation between junior and senior colleges both within and between state systems of higher education. This is particularly evident as non-traditional, independent study, and external degree programs become major factors in the higher education system of our nation.

Private institutions of higher education are also becoming more and more concerned with articulation problems which adversely affect transfer students from junior colleges. The American University, Washington, D.C., as one example, recently announced receipt of a $155,900 grant from the Educational Foundation of America to "begin an intensive program for the recruiting and advising of transfer students" at the University.[17] The new program will focus attention on the following areas:

> "Standardization and clarification of AU admissions requirements for junior college applicants;
>
> "Standardization of transfer application deadlines and acceptance notices to coincide with housing and financial aid deadlines to ensure that transfer students will have equal opportunities with other students to qualify for financial aid;
>
> "Establishment of summer advisement programs to bring transfer students to the AU campus, to provide personal academic counseling, and to make advance housing and other arrangements for a smooth transition period;

[17] News Release, The American University, Washington, D.C., October 20, 1972.

> "Special workshops for junior college counselors on the AU campus to develop close, continuing cooperation between the AU program and junior and community college counselors and to ensure that the academic and counseling programs of both institutions are complementary; and,
>
> "Offering of 'bridging' courses needed by transfer students to meet prerequisites to junior- and senior-level course-work, which transfer students may take during the summer."[18]

While directly aimed at the junior college transfer student, it is obvious this new program at the American University will benefit all its transfer students. This is particularly important since transfer students come with a wide variety of backgrounds, resources, and educational credentials.

If neither articulation agreements nor core curricula provide satisfactory resolutions to the problem of simplifying and standardizing transfer of credits from the lower division colleges to the upper divisions of other colleges and universities (or from the lower division of one 4-year institution to another 4-year institution), what alternative is available? Michigan may have the answer in terms of a modified core curriculum in the area of general and liberal arts education courses. Starting in 1973-74, a number of the four-year institutions in Michigan will accept the general education requirements of about 50% of the community colleges in the state as equal to their standards, according to a recent report from the American Council on Education.[19] The ACE report stated:

---

[18] Ibid

[19] Higher Education and National Affairs (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, November 17, 1972).

> "Officials said in a statement that five years of negotiations, led by the Michigan Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers, eliminated institutional differences in general education requirements. These involve English composition, social science, natural science and humanities and account for one year of college credits.
>
> "A total of 17 four-year institutions and 14 public community colleges joined in the formal signing ceremony. 'Most of the state's 38 four-year and 29 two-year colleges are expected to join those pioneers, but many have not completed their studies of the unprecedented pact and their approval procedures,' the announcement said."[20]

Considering the fact that any college or university which is accredited must meet the requirement of all the regional accrediting associations that "its principal educational programs should rest upon a base of liberal studies required of all or most students"[21] and that the College-Level Examination Program provides both General and Subject Examinations (see next chapter) for the subject areas covered by the Michigan pact, it is difficult indeed to understand why it is considered "unprecedented." A more appropriate term might be "long-overdue" for Michigan as well as for all other state systems of higher education.

---

[20] Ibid

[21] Policies and Procedures Handbook (Newark, N.J., Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1970).

CHAPTER 4

NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY AND EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAMS[1]

In its pure sense, the external degree is one for which a student may complete his higher education degree requirements by passing a prescribed series of examinations without pursuing a formal program of studies either on or off campus. The examinations may be developed and administered by a degree granting institution, or the institution may utilize the nationally standardized subject matter and general education examinations sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board with the advice of the Council on College-Level Examinations, and administered by the Educational Testing Service as the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). The assumption is that people are entitled to the recognition afforded by the granting of a higher education degree if they pursue independent study over a period of time and perform well in tests developed by or acceptable to the degree granting institution.

The Newman Report[2] estimates that the approximately 700,000 students who annually drop out of college would like to "drop-in" again in later years on a non-campus based or external degree program. The Educational Testing Service[3] estimates that of the some 25 million Americans engaged in adult education programs or independent study, a very large proportion would like to earn credit toward a college degree.

---

[1] For a more detailed discussion on this subject, see unpublished report by Samuel M. Burt and Herbert E. Striner, The External Degree and Higher Education in the U.S., American University, Washington, D.C., March, 1972.

[2] Report on Higher Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March, 1971 (Frank Newman, Chairman), page 10.

[3] ETS Developments, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, Fall, 1971.

Of all the non-traditional forms of higher education now being experimented with by colleges and universities in the U.S., there is no question that the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) will be intrinsic to most external degree program models, including that of the New York State Board of Regents.

Other variations of the external degree program concept such as Great Britain's Open University program (now available in the U.S. through a consortium of Rutgers, University of Maryland, Houston and California State at San Diego), the "university without walls", and the University of Oklahoma model[4], while not discussed in this paper, will also have an impact on changing present policies and procedures for handling college transfer applicants who may move in and out of "traditional" and "non-traditional" programs. The greatest impact, however, on admissions policies and practices will be the College-Level Examination Program itself.

A. The College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)

The College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) test results are used for granting both course exemption and degree credit by more than 1100 institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges[5]. Between 1967 when CLEP examinations were first given in national CLEP centers and the end of the school year 1971, approximately 15,000 candidates (exclusive of the several hundred thousand CLEP examinations administered to military personnel -- 170,347 in the one year

[4]For a detailed discussion of the University of Oklahoma program, see Roy Troutt, Special Degree Programs for Adults (Iowa City, The American College Testing Program, 1971)

[5]This does not mean that all these colleges grant credit for all the currently available CLEP examinations. Many institutions are utilizing only a few of the examinations at this moment in time.

period of 1969) have taken the examinations, with the number almost doubling each year. However, in the period July, 1971 through August, 1972 there was a quantum increase in numbers -- approximately 35,000. Part of the reason for this growth is the rapidly increasing acceptance and utilization of the CLEP examinations by both the general public, employers, and institutions of higher education. Much credit must be given to the excellent advertising and publicity campaign designed for the CLEP by the Advertising Council. During 1970-71, over 100,000 inquiries were received as a direct result of this campaign. During 1972, the campaign will be addressed to a wider audience through more communications media which have promised generous contributions of public-service time and space. The major source of funds for CLEP is the Carnegie Corporation which has contributed $3,160,000 since 1966.

There are presently 34 individual Subject Examinations and a battery of five General Examinations which comprise the CLEP testing program. The content covered by the General Examination battery is similar to the content included in the program required of many liberal arts students in the first two years of college, and were normed on a national sample of 2,582 full-time, second-term sophomores at 180 institutions of higher education. While a small number of colleges and universities will confer an Associate of Arts degree, or give two years college credit for acceptable scores on the entire battery of the General Examinations, most institutions utilizing the examinations grant less credit. A number of colleges will exempt certain courses and give varying amounts of credit for each of the five tests comprising the battery. The CLEP Council has not yet suggested a nationally standardized program of courses to be

exempted, or college credits to be granted for the General Examinations. Some colleges grant credit from one or two years of study based on the scores achieved by the examinees.

The American Council on Education's Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) has recommended that colleges and universities grant six hours of credit if scores at the 25th percentile or above are achieved on each of the five CLEP General Examination tests administered by the United States Armed Forces Institute to Armed Services personnel. However, the total amount of general education credit should not exceed 30 credits or one year's work, either at the freshmen or sophomore level. CASE also leaves it to the institution as to what courses are to be exempted and degree credit given for the General Examinations.[6]

In contrast to the General Examinations which are used to measure general educational background, the 34 Subject Examinations are designed to measure specific college course outcomes. They measure the mastery of information, ideas, and skills that would be expected of a student who has successfully completed a course in a particular subject. Almost half the examinations cover two semester courses such as American History, English, Literature, Introductory Sociology, etc.

"On the theory that credit by examination should be granted at the C level -- the same lwvel at which credit is normally granted to transfer students -- the Council recommends that credit based on CLEP Subject Examinations be granted to individuals who earn scores at or above the mean score for C students on the CLEP national norms. This is the mean

[6]Cornelius P. Turner, A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, 1968 Edition, American Council on Education, page 396, Washington, D.C.

score earned by regularly enrolled college students who participated in the national norms sample and received a grade of C in their college course in the subject named."[7] For each Subject Examination, the CLEP Council recommends the appropriate minimum cut-off score at which college credit should be given. CASE, which until recently recommended the 25th percentile for Armed Services personnel, now recommends the same minimum cut-off score as the CLEP Council.

While a growing number of colleges and universities are accepting the Council's recommendations concerning the minimum cut-off score, many more prefer to conduct normative studies for purposes of establishing their own acceptable scores. Thus, while almost all the subjects covered by the CLEP examinations are offered in most 4-year institutions and in many junior and community colleges, few institutions are as yet accepting all the CLEP subject matter examinations for credit. However, the trend is definitely in the direction of utilizing all the examinations available. In the years ahead, the College Board hopes to add several additional Subject Examinations to its offerings. Appropriate combinations of these examinations should qualify students for junior status in many programs offered by colleges and universities. As of this writing the CLEP Council has not publicly announced plans for providing upper level subject matter examinations, although there is no reason not to expect this development.

In 1967, there were 50 universities designated as centers for administering the CLEP examinations. Currently, there are more than 500 centers. Accredited collegiate institutions with explicit and publicly available policies of awarding credit on the basis of CLEP examinations

[7] CLEP Columns, College Level Examination Program, New York City, November, 1971.

are eligible to become CLEP test centers. With the expansion of testing centers, of course, there can be expected further increases in number of examinees and tests administered. Any individual may take any of the Subject Examinations upon payment of a $15 fee (the General Examination battery at a $25 fee). The tests are administered during the third week of every month during the school year.

While the problems of Armed Services personnel seeking college education and degrees is discussed in another section of this paper, recent developments in the use of CLEP examinations by the Armed Services are worth reporting here. Since CLEP's inception, servicemen and women in all parts of the world have taken hundreds of thousands of the CLEP General Examinations, at no cost, through the United States Armed Forces Institute. Arrangements have recently been consummated between the Department of Defense, USAFI, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Educational Testing Service as follows:

1. All the CLEP Subject Examinations, as well as the General Examinations, will be offered free of charge to servicemen and women everywhere.
2. All CLEP examinations are to be made available to dependents of servicemen and women, stationed overseas, as well as to overseas civilian personnel of the Armed Services.

These new policies should result in an even further dramatic increase in the presentation of CLEP examinations for credit towards college degrees. The impact on transfer admission policies of institutions of higher education should be just as dramatic as will be discussed below.

B. The New York State Board of Regents External Degree Program

The New York State Board of Regents, with a grant of $800,000 from the Carnegie Corporation and Ford Foundation in 1970, has recently announced that examinations will be available for an Associate of Arts degree in 1972, a Bachelor of Business Administration in 1973, and an Associate in Applied Science Nursing degree in 1974. The Regents will offer no formal instruction, but will award degrees to all who qualify -- regardless of their age, residence, or manner of preparation. Credits may be earned and applied to the Regent's degrees through a combination of formal college study, the examinations of the New York State College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP), the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) correspondence courses, the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board (APP), and the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP). It will also be possible to earn credit towards the degree through submission of published works, art work, and certain career experiences which will be evaluated for credit upon request. Degree candidates will also be aided in their studies through correspondence courses available from the Home Study Clearinghouse of New York's College Proficiency Examination Program.

It should be noted that the Associate in Arts degree can be earned entirely through CLEP tests alone.

While the Regents' Examination Program is not restricted to New York State residents, its own tests (CPEP) will be administered only in New York testing centers, according to present plans. The CLEP (and APP tests by special arrangements) can be administered in any CLEP test center in

the U.S., and for Armed Services personnel, the CLEP tests can be administered anywhere in the world through arrangements made with USAFI. However, the Regents have already demonstrated their willingness to assist other states in establishing their external degree programs. New Jersey's program, to be administered by the newly established Thomas A. Edison College, has been developed with the cooperation of the New York State Regents. The Edison College is strictly an external degree institution and will have no on-campus students. It will begin operation in July, 1972.

The New York Regents expect a first year enrollment of some 25,000 students. The fact that the Regents will grant degrees based on a combination of options for earning credit without attending college in New York state, will have great appeal to many individuals who will be able to arrange to travel to New York on those occasions that require their presence for testing purposes. Such occasions can be minimal, since all the requirements for the AA degree, and part of the requirements for the other two degrees, can be met by CLEP examinations which are administered monthly in numerous testing centers throughout the U.S.

C. Home Study Programs

Since the external degree concept is based on independent study, with the examination and awarding of degree as the capstone, it is of interest to discuss the role of home or correspondence study programs as they relate to traditional transfer admissions policies and the examination programs discussed above.

Over 60 universities offer a wide variety of home study or correspondence courses for credit at the undergraduate level, and six offer

courses for graduate credit. Over 300,000 students were enrolled in university-offered programs during 1969 according to the National Home Study Council, Washington, D.C. All of the institutions are accredited by the educational accrediting agency of the region in which they are located. Many colleges and universities will accept up to 30 credit hours, and some will accept as much as 60 credit hours earned by such correspondence school study toward a bachelor's degree.

Many institutions of higher education will accept for transfer any courses taken through accredited university conducted correspondence study, if the university offering the home study courses accept them in their own degree programs. Some universities will only accept those courses for transfer credit which parallel or are similar to courses offered by the receiving university, and may or may not require the transfer student to also take a qualifying examination in that subject. The number of credit hours earned through correspondence will vary according to the policies of receiving colleges and universities.

The American School is a commercial correspondence school offering home study courses designed to prepare students to pass the CLEP examinations. Established in 1897 as a non-profit organization, and rated as the second largest home study organization in the U.S., the American School, in addition to its high school level courses, offers some 20 courses tied into the CLEP Subject Examinations.

The USAFI and Armed Services correspondence study programs will be discussed later in this paper in the section devoted to Armed Services personnel.

The immediate goal of those enrolling in correspondence courses offered by colleges and universities appears to be the attainment of a degree, according to Dr. Sharon, who quotes several studies in support of this conclusion[8]. However, there are two major reasons Sharon postulates for the unwillingness of colleges and universities to grant credit for correspondence work. One is the generally negative attitude of institutional educators towards correspondence instruction. The other reason is the absence of a national accreditation agency acceptable to higher education institutions. Citing the recommendation of the 1968 Correspondence Education Research Project (CERP)[9], calling for a national examining university, Sharon suggests that such a university could establish standards for accreditation of various types of non-traditional study courses and issue degrees at all levels upon appropriate demonstration of completion of the courses. This national university might incorporate existing national testing programs such as the General Educational Development (GED) Program and the College Level Examination Program (CLEP)[10].

D. Potential Impact of External Degree Programs on College Admissions Procedures for Transfer Students.

Only the CLEP, the New York State Board of Regents and correspondence school programs have been discussed in this section, because other types of college level studies which are classified under the rubric of non-traditional college studies, such as the "university without walls"

[8]Amiel T. Sharon, College Credit for Off-Campus Study, Report 8, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March, 1971.

[9]O. Mackenzie, E.L. Christensen, and P.H. Rigby, Correspondence Instruction in the U.S. (New York City; McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969)

[10]Amiel Sharon, op. cit. (page 4).

concept really combine independent study, classroom attendance, community service, "contracts" between the student and the university, and examinations. They are not external degree programs completely dependent on examinations for a degree, but the programs can often be pursued by a student with minimal requirements for on-campus classwork, thus not usually necessitating transfer from one college to another if the student moves to another area. However, in the event a student enrolled in one of these non-traditional programs does attempt to transfer to a traditionally oriented institution, he will encounter considerable difficulty in obtaining recognition of his previous college-level work for credit towards a degree. The best he can hope for is acceptance of courses he may have taken, and being permitted to take examinations for those other courses which he believes should be waived. Even then, he may succeed in having the course waived, but not receive credit toward a degree.

Whether or not enrollments in college-sponsored or offered correspondence courses will expand is mere speculation. The probabilities are that even if this does happen it will be the CLEP Subject Examinations which will play a major role as end-of-course tests and/or credentialization for course exemption toward degree credit. This is further supported by the recommendation of the Commission on the Accreditation of Service Experience (CASE) of the American Council on Education that CLEP be used to validate learning acquired in military service.[11]

The CLEP Examinations and the New York State Board of Regents type of external degree program, through the sheer weight of numbers of students seeking to transfer college-level credits earned in these programs, will be

[11] The College Board News, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, May, 1972 (page 4).

one of the major forces in compelling institutions of higher education to liberalize, simplify and standardize their transfer student admission policies and practices. The rapidly growing numbers of college students utilizing CLEP (more in the months of July, 1971 through August, 1972 as in the four preceding years) and the new policy of the Armed Services in administering CLEP Subject Examinations to military personnel overseas, as well as the General and Subject Examinations to their dependents and to civilian employees, will result literally in hundreds of thousands of CLEP course examinations being submitted each year for transfer credit. No longer will the receiving colleges be able to afford the time and cost of the procedures currently in effect for obtaining and examining individual CLEP examination scores for acceptance or rejection according to individually adopted institutional standards (see Appendix A).

Another compelling force for change in the diversity of patterns for awarding transfer credit for non-traditional college studies will be the large numbers of students enrolling in the state-chartered programs modeled after the New York State Board of Regents External Degree Program. Legislators, having seen the need for these programs to meet the public's demand for college level studies and degrees in ways other than attending college classes, will not long permit the colleges in their states receiving public funds -- certainly not the public institutions -- to individually determine how many credit hours, if any will be accepted on transfer from the state's own external college degree program.

A third, and quite subtle force for facilitating liberalization and simplification of transfer student admissions procedures, can be expected

to develop as the CLEP Subject Examinations are expanded in both number and use. This will come about because of the basic assumption on which each examination is formulated. In order to prepare a subject matter examination, the CLEP researchers must first find a course taught by a sufficiently large number of institutions of higher education in which the subject matter presented is generally at the same level and coverage. This means that a CLEP examination for a particular course or subject -- e.g., American History I -- certifies for all practical purposes that American History I as taught in most institutions of higher education substantially covers the same body of knowledge. Thus, the fact that a CLEP examination exists for this course can be translated into accepting the course itself, if passed with a satisfactory grade, for transfer credit without any further investigation by the receiving college. Since there are presently 34 CLEP Subject Examinatons, and very shortly there will be more, colleges and universities throughout the U.S. will be able to save a considerable amount of admissions office time and cost in not having to search other college catalogs to ascertain the degree of similarity of those courses covered by CLEP Subject Examinations. In effect, there will soon exist a fairly large number of courses which can be accepted for transfer by almost any institution of higher education with the assurance they are similar in nature and content regardless of the institution in which the student has taken the course. This factor alone will have a tremendous impact -- both on student selection of courses during early years of college studies, and on the movement to simplify and standardize the admissions office student transfer process.

It should be pointed out that the existence of a CLEP Subject Examination for a particular course, e.g., Sociology 101, does not mean there is a norm as to what Sociology 101 ought to be in every college in the country. All that the CLEP Subject Examination does mean is that a certain amount of knowledge in sociology equivalent to the introductory level, as recognized and acknowledged by most universities, is being tested by the CLEP Examination. Lack of understanding this distinction has cauded considerable concern by a number of college faculties, who also see the availability of the examinations as a possible excuse for diminishing the need for teachers. Some faculties have adopted resolutions urging their institution's administrators not to utilize CLEP. Many college administrators are also expressing concern about the potential loss of income to their institutions through the use of the CLEP examinations. Students and their parents may be delighted at saving tuition costs, e.g., estimated by the University of Utah at $1 million last year for its entering students.[12] To the institution, however, this represents a loss of that same amount in tuition fees. Some colleges and universities are beginning to charge partial and even full tuition fees even though the student is exempted from the course due to having taken the CLEP examination; but most institutions are still not charging any tuition for such course exemptions. It may well be that colleges and universities will eventually charge some minimal fee to at least cover administrative and record keeping costs in accepting CLEP examinations (and possibly courses) submitted for transfer credit purposes. In any event, it is doubtful that any countermovement to the

[12] CLEP Columns, College Level Examination Program, College Entrance Examination Board, New York City, May, 1972.

growth and use of CLEP, the New York Board of Regents examinations, and other external degree programs will achieve success. The external degree concept is here to stay and will inevitably grow as a major option for many millions of individuals seeking a college degree.

E. National Examining and Accrediting University

As a matter of fact, the soon-to-be-released Newman Report 2 goes even further than the CLEP concept by recommending the establishment of regional examining universities, previously advanced by two authorities in the field of external degree programs, Jack Arbolino and John Valley of the Council on College-Level Examination Program and Educational Testing Service respectively.

> "These would be examining and degree granting institutions at least as autonomous as any new unit within a state system.[13]

Newman calls for Federal funding of these institutions because of the costly process of test development and experimental evaluation as applied to the off-campus situation. He also suggests that these institutions study the feasibility of achievement-oriented testing in providing college credit for life exleriences.

Given the state of the art of computerizing information, the existence of CLEP, the New York Board of Regents external examinations program, and the Open University of Great Britain program in the U.S., it appears that "regional examining universities" would provide unneeded "overkill." With over 500 CLEP testing centers, and the willingness of the New York Regents to accept CLEP examinations in addition to its own, it might be

[13] Frank Newman, A Preview of the Second Newman Report", Change, New Rochelle, New York, May 6, 1972.

much more reasonable to establish a single National Examining and Accrediting University which could be funded by the Federal Government and serve as a national repository for college grades and credits accumulated by non-traditional students, if they so wished, and to issue a National University degree. The National University could also provide funds for experimental programs by CLEP, the New York Board of Regents, etc. Furthermore the National University might also absorb the functions of the American Council on Education's Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience (CASE). Or CASE might expand its program into that of a National Examining and Accrediting University. The programs now administered by CASE which could serve as the foundation for the National University are:

1. The General Educational Development Tests which are used by state departments of education as a basis for issuance of high school equivalency certificates. During 1971, the Council administered the GED tests to 387,733 adults in 1,858 centers.[14] These figures do not include the Armed Services personnel who also took the tests in 1971.
2. CASE is responsible for the preparation and publication of A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services, 1968, and supplementary reports. This Guide is used by almost every college and university in helping determine the equivalent college credit which should be allowed for almost every Armed Forces education and

[14] Higher Education and National Affairs, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., May 19, 1972.

training program. When there is a question about some particular program, colleges and universities usually request a special evaluation for a particular student. In 1971, such requests were submitted to CASE for over 1,000 students seeking credit for almost 3,000 courses.[15]

3. The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) Subject Standardized Tests (60 at the college level) are constructed and standardized under contracts with educational institutions and agencies in accordance with test specifications and procedures approved by CASE. Tests are administered at USAFI Testing Sections and are supervised by a USAFI Test Control Officer under security procedures approved by the Department of Defense and CASE.

Previously mentioned herein is the recommendation of CERF for a "national university" to accredit and certify correspondence study courses for college degrees. Another justification for the suggested national university, is the fact that the U.S. Air Force has recently announced the establishment of its Community College of the Air Force. In effect, this college will serve as a repository of all records of college and equivalent courses and credits which an airman may accumulate toward the degree of an Associate of Science in Technology, and will issue a certificate to this effect. The other branches of the Armed Services may also want to establish such a program. The National Examining and Accrediting University could incorporate such an effort into

[15] NOTE: This data was provided by CASE staff to the author by telephone, May 25, 1972.

its program, and thus eliminate the obvious duplication and expenditure of public funds which would be involved.

The merit of a National Examining and Accrediting University for resolving some of the major problems of college transfer students in both traditional and non-traditional studies and programs requires considerable additional study. Dr. Samuel Gould's Commission on Non-Traditional Study will have some recommendations in this area in its report to be published early in 1973. In the meanwhile, it appears that the New York Board of Regents has already begun to fill this role in some respects. If many other states follow suit, a separate single National Examining and Accrediting University may be politically impossible to establish, unless done so in the very near future.

CHAPTER 5

ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL

Of the approximately 2,500,000 Armed Services men and women in the military services of the U.S. in 1971, some 800,000 were enrolled in all types of formal educational and training programs. Of this number, it is estimated that over 164,000 completed some 247,000 undergraduate college level courses in 1971. Table 9 shows these course completions by branch of service.

Table 9

Undergraduate College Course Completion by Armed Services Personnel 1971

Service	Number Courses
Army	89,008
Air Force	120,828
Navy	27,760
Marines	9,330
TOTAL	246,926

(Estimated number of service personnel enrolled - 164,617)

Source: Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Education)

While no data are available as to how many military personnel have sought to transfer their college course credits from either the Armed Services educational, training and testing programs, or from one civilian institution of higher education which they may have attended off duty, to another institution, it can be assumed that many of those who annually do complete undergraduate college level courses will eventually seek a

college degree. Given this assumption, the Armed Services could well be the major source of potential civilian college students in the U.S.; and that possibly individuals presently serving in the military forces, or who are veterans, comprise a major share of the approximately 500,000 transfer students presently in college.

Other data tend to support this conclusion. For example 80.6% of the enlisted personnel in 1971, out of a total of 2,146,390, graduated from high school, and 5% from college. In addition, 45,000 servicemen received their General Educational Development certificate while on active duty last year from their State Departments of Education, and another 45,000 were qualified for the GED by USAFI. Again, in 1971, some 5,000 Navy personnel were enrolled in some 40 college level courses offered aboard ship by the Navy under contract with 5 senior colleges and universities. This Navy program, titled Program for Afloat College Education (PACE) is scheduled for expansion in 1972. In addition, of the total 185,000 courses in which Armed Service personnel were enrolled under the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) in 1971, some 75,000 were at the college undergraduate level. And servicemen passed 97,000 College Level Examination Program examinations in 1971, with more than 19,000 earning up to two years advanced placement at colleges accepting CLEP examinations.[1]

---

[1] The data in this paragraph was taken from several sources, including: Anne L. Ducey, "Higher Education for the Military", Change, New Rochelle, New York, April, 1972.

One of the most significant studies concerning the ability of adults to do college level work was conducted with 43,877 military personnel who took the CLEP General Examinations in the period July, 1965 - December, 1966. It was found that from 12 to 27 percent of the servicemen who had not studied beyond the high school level scored as well as the average college sophomore. It was concluded that "a large number of military personnel who have had no formal higher education can score as well or better than the average college sophomore on tests of academic achievement."[2] It should be noted that this study sample was a self-selected one and therefore not representative of either the military population or the American adult population. Nevertheless, the study does support "the assumption that there are substantial numbers of adults whose educational accomplishments are comparable to that of formally trained college students."[3]

In looking at the Vietnam-era veterans, we find that as of September, 1971, there were 5,138,000 such individuals. Only about 35% have participated in post-secondary educational programs, with approximately 953,000 enrolled in college-level programs. With one million servicemen released in 1971, and somewhat more than that number expected to be released in 1972, there is still a large number of former Armed Services personnel, many of whom were enrolled in college level educational or training programs during their service, who are prime candidates as college students.[4]

---

[2]Amiel T. Sharon, "Adult Academic Achievement in Relation to Formal Education and Age", Adult Education, Number 4, Chapel Hill, N.C., Summer, 1971.

[3]Amiel T. Sharon, ibid.

[4]See A Question of Stewardship, Sixth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, Washington, D.C., March, 1971 (pp. 78-83).

The currently large numbers of military personnel and veterans now enrolled in higher education programs is expected to increase considerably in the near future when the Armed Services consists entirely of volunteers. One of the major inducements for enlisting will be the promise of a college education while in the Service. But if traditional policies, practices and procedures for accepting transfer students continue to dominate collegiate circles, this promise will not be entirely fulfilled. The military and the veteran face many obstacles in extending previously obtained course credits towards a degree.

> "A serviceman is much more mobile than the usual college student. In moving from one duty assignment to another, he must also transfer colleges. Often he discovers that credits earned at one institution are not accpetable at a new school, that he will be given credit only for courses in which he earned A or B grades, that work in his major field must be duplicated, or that credit given for non-traditional education at the first school is not recognized at the second school. The higher the level of education, the more restrictive are the rules regarding transfer of credit and the accrediting of nontraditional work. It is difficult for the most motivated of students to continue an education when it is so hard to prove that what he has in his educational bag adds up to a B.S. or an M.A. degree."[5]

There is probably no better phrase than "educational bag" to describe what most military personnel and veterans bring to a college in the form of course credits for transfer to a degree. With little if any academic or career counseling, and a high rate of mobility, the military personnel usually enroll in whatever college courses are available, seem interesting or can conveniently be attended at a college near his or her base, or in classes offered by a college on base. Many of these courses in which the military enroll are offered only by the extension or continuing education divisions of colleges, and for unexplainable reasons, are not creditable toward a degree program, even in

---

[5] Anne L. Ducey, op. cit.

the institution sponsoring the course. The following transcript submitted by a veteran seeking a degree at a senior institution is fairly typical of the smorgasboard of college level courses taken by military personnel during their years of service. The only change made by the author of this paper in copying the transcript, extending from 1943 to 1964, is in the names of the colleges involved.

University A, Greenville, South Carolina, 1943

Civil Air Reg.
English
Math
Navigation
Physics
Medical Aid
Theory of Flt.
Meteorology

University B, Athens, Georgia, 1957-1958

Elementary Psychology
Introductory Sociology
American Government

University C, Baltimore, Maryland, 1958-1961

Philosophy for Modern Man
Criminology
Military History

University D, Los Angeles, California, 1962-1964

Introduction to Electronics
Electronic Fabrication
Electronic Calc.
Basic Electronic Instr.
General Electronics
Advance Circuit Anal.
Interm Electronics
Electronic Fabrication
Interm Elec. Inst.
Advance Electronics
Electronic Fabrication
Cultural Anth.
Electronic Fabrication
History of U.S.
History of U.S.

Military Record Restricted Credit

Basic Military Science
Advanced Military Science
Military Leadership
P E
Speech

GED Tests - Restricted Credit

English Composition
Social Science
Natural Science
Humanities

USAFI Tests - Restricted Credit

Commer Course

Service Schools - Restricted Credit

Business Organization and Management

This record was submitted in 1964 to a midwestern university with a reputation for being extremely liberal in accepting military service college level courses. After attending the university for one semester and a summer, enrolled in the following courses:

Social Organ.
Prin. of Econ.
Prin. of Econ.
Public Admin.
American Const. History
American Col. History
America From 1840

the veteran received the degree of Bachelor of General Education in Military Science. In 1972 he applied for entrance to a graduate degree program in Public Administration at a liberal eastern university, but was not accepted. Whether or not any university would accept either this degree or college record for admittance to a graduate professional program is highly doubtful!

Just as in Furniss' classic Sergeant X case study, there may be an "embarrasment of riches" in this veteran's college record, but his "chances of getting his degree are about one in fifty under present arrangements."[6] Dr. Furniss explains that despite the fact his Sergeant X may have accumulated the equivalent of the spread of courses for a bachelor's degree, he may not receive the degree from any existing institution of higher education because:

> "1. There is no common curriculum for the whole B.A. program applicable to all degree-granting institutions. Most are alike in the lower-division work for the B.A., but they are unlike -- and pride themselves on individuality -- at the level of the major. Thus, specifications for the major for Sgt. X at Institution A will almost inevitably be changed if he turns to Institution B.
>
> "2. There are no common quality standards. Performance (for example, on a CLEP subject exam) acceptable for six hours at Institution A may get 3, 0, or 9 hours at Institution B. Thus "credits" are not "credits" until they have been accepted by the institution that will award the degree. And experience tells us that institutions are very reluctant to accept transfer of full credit.
>
> "3. Residence limitations block the transfer of credit.... conventionally, each institution requires at least one year -- or thirty semester hours -- of 'residence' just prior to the granting of the degree, 'residence' defined as taking our courses with our departmental faculty. (Curiously, in some instances, residence may not include work with our institution's own extension division faculty.)"[7]

Furniss believes that the dilemma of Sergeant X is in no way different from that of any other transfer student except that the problem is exacerbated by his greater "forced" mobility, and his attendance at more colleges or enrollment in more nontraditional college level courses. However, there is one major difference between the military

---

[6] W. Todd Furniss, Degrees for Nontraditional Students, Special Report (Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, April 9, 1971).

[7] Furniss, ibid.

personnel transfer student and the civilian transfer student - the military student has a powerful advocate for changing the situation. Some of the steps now being taken (discussed below) by the Armed Services alone, and in cooperation with national educational organizations, will shortly change the picture for the military and the veterans. Hopefully, these changes will have beneficial repercussions for the civilian transfer students.

a. The Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges

At the request of and in cooperation with the Department of Defense, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges established a Task Force on Extending Educational Opportunities for Servicemen in January, 1972. By June, 1972 this Task Force had developed a concept whereby selected junior and community colleges are to be designated as Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges which will offer the following services and meet the following criteria:

I. A Servicemen's Opportunity College will have liberal entrance requirements.

   A. A high school diploma or equivalency based upon satisfactory scores in the General Educational Development Test are adequate educational credentials for enrollment in a degree program except in those instances where prerequisites are required for all students.

   B. In those colleges not restricted by state or local regulations the above requirement may be waived and students evidencing promise may be admitted who lack a high school diploma or equivalency certificate.

   C. In no case will an individual be penalized by additional requirements because he is a serviceman.

II. A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides opportunities for servicemen to pursue educational program goals through courses offered on base, in the evenings, on weekends, and at other nontraditional time frames.

III. A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides opportunities for servicemen to complete courses through special means or optional nontraditional modes when his education is interrupted by military obligations.

IV. A servicemen's Opportunity College provides special academic assistance to students in need of this assistance through:

A. The availability of tutorial services or similar learning assistance at times and in locations convenient to servicemen.

B. The designation of a trained servicemen's counselor who is availabile at times and in locations convenient to servicemen who will assist them in program planning, and guide them in their understanding of all educational options available to them at this and all other Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges.

C. The implementation of PREP programs which are sponsored by the college at the base where feasible.

V. A Servicemen's Opportunity College offers maximum credit for educational experiences obtained in the armed services.

A. College policy permits and encourages granting credit for Untied States Armed Forces Institute courses that are relevant to a student's program of studies.

B. College policy permits and encourages granting exemption from and credit by examination for courses that are relevant to a student's program of studies, through the use of any or all of the following: College Level Examination Program (CLEP), College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP), Institutional "challenge" examinations.

C. College policy permits and encourages granting credit for appropriate educational experiences in the armed services in accordance with their evaluation in the American Council on Education's 1968 Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services or by the Commission on the Accreditation of Service Experiences evaluation service.

D. College policy permits exemption from or credit for required health or physical education course requirements for servicemen who have had at least one year of active military service.

E. The major portion of the associate degree requirements can be earned through the above nontraditional learning modes.

VI. A Serviceman's Opportunity College has residencey requirements which are adaptable to the mobility and special needs of servicemen.

A. Temporal residency requirements may be fulfilled in any sequence at any time in the student's program.

B. Residency requirements may be fulfilled by completion of any educational program sponsored by the college whether offered on-campus or off-campus.

C. At least one of the following options will be available to servicemen.

CONTRACT FOR DEGREE

1. A "contract for degree" option is available to servicemen. A serviceman may contract with a Servicemen's Opportunity College at any appropriate point in time; usually it will be the college of his initial enrollment. The college will designate an advisor, who will assist the serviceman in contracting for his degree with the institution. The contract should specify the course of study to be pursued and appropriate learning options in accordance with the above criteria. The advisor continues to guide the serviceman's educational planning when he is forced to transfer to other institutions in accordance with his duty assignment. As long as he is being effectively guided by his advisor, he will be permitted to transfer in reverse appropriate credits earned at other institutions back to the original institution -- in essence, a reverse transfer policy. The institution agrees to provide a repository for all academic records of the individual. The contracting college will award the serviceman the appropriate certificate or degree upon fulfillment of the contract.

2. The college will waive or eliminate residency requirements for servicemen.

3. Where residency requirements are restricted by state law, the college will make every effort to receive an exemption for servicemen.

VII. A Servicemen's Opportunity College has a transfer policy that is generous in recognition of traditional and non-traditional learning obtained at other institutions.

Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges to which servicemen transfer will accept, as a minimum, the level of credit applied by all regionally-accredited colleges in which servicemen have been enrolled in comparable programs, both for traditional and nontraditional learning experiences, when validated by subsequent individual success in traditional study modes.

VIII. A Servicemen's Opportunity College provides for a representative local advisory council which will aid the college in carrying out its mission in relation to servicemen.

IX. A Servicemen's Opportunity College will publicize and promote its SOC policies by inserting them in its college catalog and by other appropriate manners.

X. A Servicemen's Opportunity Center will maintain its commitments to servicemen students previously enrolled, if for any reason it discontinues its status as a Servicemen's Opportunity College.

NOTE: It is strongly urged that Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges extend these policies where applicable to include dependents of servicemen.

The Department of Defense, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and several other national educational organizations represented on the Task Force are quite enthusiastic about the possibilities of the S.O.C. concept resolving much of the dilemma of the serviceman's efforts to obtain a college degree. The idea of a "home college' offering academic and career counseling to the serviceman when he first enrolls in college, and then accepting all courses for degree credit which generally coincide with the career plan regardless of where taken or how, serving as a record repository, and finally issuing the degree regardless of residency period, is a very real breakthrough in present practices. It is believed that once the feasibility of this concept is demonstrated by an experimental number of junior and community colleges, it is expected that at least 200 throughout the U.S. will be ultimately incorporated into the program. Furthermore, it is expected that a number of senior institutions will also request

designation as Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges in order to provide the same services leading to a Bachelor's Degree.

Since the counseling function is of major significance to the S.O.C. concept, it is fortunate that both the College Entrance Examination Board's "Decision Making Program", and the American College Testing Program's "Assessment Program" and "Career Planning Program" are available. The two ACT programs in particular are admirably suited for academic and career counseling and planning. "More than 500 community, junior, and business colleges; vocational-technical institutes; and other career education schools" located in 46 states and the District of Columbia are using these ACT program services.[8] Either one or both the ACT and CEEB counseling assisting programs will undoubtedly be utilized by the Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges, and thereby extend their use to entering civilian students as a matter of normal procedure rather than waiting for individual students to seek assistance from the college counseling staff.

b. Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Early in 1972 the American Council on Education, with financial assistance from the Department of Defense through USAFI, called the eleven institutions of higher education forming the Committee on Institutional Cooperation[9] (CIC) to engage in a project leading to a publication titled, Education for the Itinerant Student: A Guide to Opportunities in Liberal Arts and Sciences at CIC Universities. The purpose of this publication is to describe how these institutions[10] will accommodate students in liberal arts

[8] Activity, American College Testing Program, Vol. X, No. 1, January, 1972 (p. 3).

[9] Note: The information for this section of the report was excerpted from a memo dated March 20, 1972 from W. Todd Furniss, American Council on Education, and Robin S. Wilson, Committee on Institutional Cooperation, to Committee members.

[10] University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, University of Wisconsin.

and sciences who are involuntarily itinerant and thus are unable to meet conventional residency and other requirements. Itinerant students include, among others, military personnel, women who move with their families, part-time students moving according to job requirements, and minors moving with their parents.

"The preparation of the GUIDE is a first step in a more comprehensive program proposed for CIC institutions, elements of which are still under consideration. The GUIDE itself can be important in these ways:

> "...it will require a group of institutions to develop a common set of terms applicable to the special cases of itinerant students, in place of the uncodified, mostly informal, and (to all but the local institution) incomprehensible terms they now use. For example, we might be able to come up with a substitute for "residence requirement" which could represent an invitation, not a barrier, to itinerant students.
>
> "...It will require the institutions to examine their own practices in the light of a set of circumstances that did not exist when the practices were established. This re-examination should lead to the modification, not only the codification, of practices dealing with the itinerant student. Transfer of credit, credit by examination, credit for experience, advising services, variations of time-on-campus requirements are among these.
>
> "...The GUIDE itself, with its new terms and its demonstration of concern to assist rather than balk the ambitions of the itinerant student, can become a model for other bachelor's (and later professional) degree-granting institutions who are themselves uncertain about what practices would be helpful, or what terms to put them in, or what company they would be keeping if they went "too far." Although not every kind of institution will be represented by CIC, both public and private institutions are included and, more importantly, we are including the toughest nut to be cracked: the various disciplines within liberal arts.
>
> "...Preparation of the GUIDE will, we think, help CIC institutions to clarify the possibilities in the proposals still under CIC consideration and hasten the adoption of some form of them."[11]

[11] Memo dated March 20, 1972 from Dr. Furniss and Dr. Wilson, op. cit.

It is expected that the Guide will be available early in 1973. It is also expected that not only will its recommendations help liberalize, standardize and simplify transfer of college course credits for military servicemen and women as well as civilian "itinerant students" among the CIC institutions, but will also accomplish the same objectives for many other colleges and universities which accept some modicum of leadership from the CIC group.

c. Expanded Use of the CLEP Examinations by the Armed Services

According to the College Entrance Examination Board, the CLEP Examinations may be the serviceman's best educational friend. In May, 1972, the College Board issued the following announcement.

> "Through the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) the General and Subject Examinations are available to him free of charge. Thus, he has a chance of getting credit by examination at almost a thousand colleges and universities throughout the country. The Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) recommends credit on the basis of CLEP tests. The system is working, and working more efficiently every month. Since CLEP's inception, servicemen and women have taken hundreds of thousands of tests. Both the American Council on Education and the American Association of Junior Colleges regard the Program as an important extension of educational opportunity to men and women in the armed services. Although from the very beginning, servicemen and women have constituted the largest block of candidates and been among our most effective emissaries, until recently the Subject Examinations have not been available to them. Now, through the cooperation of the Department of Defense, USAFI, the College Entrance Examination Board, and Educational Testing Service, all the Subject Examinations, as well as the General Examinations, will be offered free of charge to servicemen and women everywhere.
>
> "In March another forward step was taken toward increased access to higher education. Nathan Brodsky, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Education) issued a memorandum stating that CLEP tests would be available to dependents and employees overseas. Thus, two new large civilian groups now have access to CLEP tests in many different parts of the world."[12]

[12] CLEP Columns, College Level Examination Program, College Entrance Examination Board, New York City, May, 1972.

It should be noted that while the CLEP fees for servicemen and women are paid by the Department of Defense, civilian personnel and dependents of military personnel overseas will be required to pay the fees. However, they will be able to take the tests in USAFI testing centers. As an indication of the number of CLEP tests which will be taken by Department of Defense servicemen, their dependents, and civilian employees, USAFI reported that in 1969 over 170,000 CLEP General Examination tests were administered. About 56% of the tests were passed by the serviceman and servicewoman. With the availability of CLEP Subject Ma· tests, it is quite conceivable that over 300,000 CLEP tests will be administered annually by USAFI within the next few years. In addition to the fact that colleges and universities accept these tests for course exemption and degree credit, the New York Board of Regents will award an Associate of Arts degree on the basis of certain designated CLEP examinations alone. It can be anticipated that many Department of Defense personnel will seek and obtain this degree for transfer to major study programs at 4-year institutions of higher education. Here again, as noted previously, the sheer number of CLEP examinations from the Armed Services and veterans alone must have an impact on either persuading or forcing, senior institutions to revise their conventional and traditional attitudes, policies and practices toward accepting non-traditional studies and grades for transfer and degree credit.

d. The Community College of the Air Force (CCAF)

The Community College of the Air Force, expected to be activated late in 1972, has been under consideration by Air Force officials for less than 2 years. As currently conceived, it will be responsible for implementing or monitoring:

1. accreditation of Air Force education and training activities by external accrediting agencies,

2. consolidation of Air Force education and training schools into a consortium,

3. recognition of Air Force education and training activities by professional, industrial, and government organizations having licensing, certification, and standard-setting authority,

4. development of internal standards, policies, and procedures for granting Air Force certificates and diplomas and recommending how these achievements may be related to Air Force careers,

5. operation of an automated central transcript service to include authentication by CCAF seal,

6. issuance of a catalog setting forth academic practices and programs available in Air Force schools and cooperating institutions,

7. development of procedures for making available unclassified materials from Air Force technical training programs for use in civilian schools,

8. development of programs to provide instruction which will ease the transition of Air Force personnel from military to civilian status, and

9. development of proposals for enabling legislation as required.[13]

The CCAF, according to its president, Col. John L. Phipps, was conceived as a strategy to give full recognition and accreditation for its more than 3,750 technical training courses conducted at a cost of over $400 million annually. He argues that the airman is frequently frustrated in the knowledge that, "though he is able to travel all over the world experiencing no difficulty in transferring his special training from base to base, the excellent training he has received is not documented in a transcript form, nor is it presentable in any accreditable way to educational institutions, employers or licensing authorities outside the

[13] John L. Phipps, "Development of a Community College of the Air Force", USAFI Instructors Journal, April, 1972.

government.... The service member is, therefore, left to fend for himself on an individual basis with little or no assitance when he moves from one area to another and takes little with him when he departs for civilian life."[14]

While recognizing the role of the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) in evaluating service experiences and recommending college credit, Phipps claims that such recognition is for "experience" rather than "education", and generally presumed to be of minor importance in the degree program. Considerable publicity has been issued by Col. Phipps and the Air Force concerning the Community College, its reasons for establishment, and its mission. Some of the statements are contradictory and others are not entirely accurate. However, there is no question but that some action is needed to force colleges and universities to liberalize and standardize their policies and practices concerning acceptance of Armed Services experiences, particularly in those programs usually characterized as vocational and technical. By the same token, employers may find the transcript of the airman's record, as issued by the CCAF, extremely useful in evaluating the job competency of the airman. However, when Phipps talks about the CCAF issuing an Associate of Science in Technology (possible only if Congress passes enabling legislation) for acceptance by senior institutions for entrance into the junior year, he will be very disappointed. The Associate degree, either in Arts or Sciences, is seldom automatically accepted for entrance into the upper division of a senior institution; although there is a growing movement to do so.

---

[14] John L. Phipps, ibid.

Other questions about the CCAF center around the extent to which the Air Force has consulted concerned national educational organizations and obtained their endorsement. Such endorsement is almost a sine qua non if the CCAF is to receive approval and cooperation of the world of higher education. In the meanwhile, its very existence may have a salutary effect on colleges and universities - and their national associations - which are still wedded to traditional restrictive practices concerning the acceptance of college level course credit obtained in nontraditional institutions and methods. While none of the other Armed Service branches have exhibited any interest as yet in establishing their own Community Colleges, the CCAF does provide a precedent and a threat to established civilian institutions which will not go unheeded.

CHAPTER 6

Prison Inmates and Releasees as College Transfer Students

Educational programs for inmates in the federal, state and local prisons has become a part of our modern day penal system as it attempts to move from the philosophy of incarceration and punishment to that of rehabilitation, or better yet, "abilitation." Professionals and laymen alike believe that education can play a vital role in this process, although this belief is as yet based more on intuition than on evaluative research. Nevertheless, ever increasing numbers of inmates are taking advantage of the elementary, high school, vocational, and college level educational programs being offered in federal and state prisons.

The federal prison system has 26 institutions containing approximately 21,000 men and women on any given day. This figure represents about 5% of the approximately 460,000 prisoners in the federal and state system prisons. Federal offender participation in selected educational programs is presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Federal Prison Offender Participation in Selected Institutional Educational Programs 1971[1]

Program	Enrollments	Completions	No. of Institutions
G E D Preparation	3,971	2,068	26
High School Courses	3,390	1,818	20
College Courses	1,953	1,255	16

[1] Education and Training of Incarcerated Federal Prisoners, Annual Report, Calendar Year 1971 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, 1972).

The number of inmates in federal prisons enrolled in college-level courses represents approximately 50% of all such students in the federal and state prison systems. It is of further interest to note that many prisoners who complete their high school education in prison, either through the GED program or high school diploma, and remain in prison, enroll in college-level courses.

A 1968 study of college level instruction in U.S. prisons suggests the possibility of as many as 25,000 prisoners being involved in higher education in U.S. prisons in the not too distant future. Following are some cogent findings of this study.[2]

> "This survey has disclosed a wide involvement in college-level education in the prison systems of the U.S. More than half the existing systems report some form of higher education going on within their jurisdictions.
>
> "For the present, the form of higher education that is found in most prison systems is still the correspondence course...
>
> "....There appears to be a strong shift toward live instruction through staff from extension divisions of colleges and universities.... About one-third of the prison systems in the U.S. now report the use of college extension in their educational programs.
>
> "Seven prison systems mention the A.A., the A.S., or the A.G.E. degree as being possible now or at some time in the near future.
>
> "At the present time only about 3,000 -- slightly more than one percent -- of the inmates in the state and federal prisons are involved in such (ed.: college-level) courses. However, it might be projected that before long as many as 25,000 prisoners will be involved in higher education in the U.S.

---

[2]Stuart Adams, College Level Instruction in U.S. Prisons (Berkeley, California; School of Criminology, University of California, January, 1968).

> "The estimate may be an interim figure that will easily be superceded when "universities of the air", telewriters, community college systems, school release programs and other technical and social developments have become perfected and become accepted."[3]

Another 1968 study of educational programs in prisons disclosed a total of 148 institutions reporting college programs involving 3,757 inmate-students, with 84 providing some form of live instruction. "The most widely used program is one which is conducted by visiting instructors within the institution, but a significant number of study-release programs are developing which allow the student to attend class 'on-campus' during the day and return to the institution at night."[4] Among the conclusions reached by the authors of this study, McCabe and Driscoll, was:

> "If the present rate of increase continues, it is quite possible that the majority of U.S. inmates will someday soon have the opportunity to complete their entire elementary and high school education and a portion of their college degree requirements during their period of incarceration."[5]

What happens to the prison inmate who has successfully completed college level courses while in prison if and when he attempts to enroll in a college and transfer his course credits upon release? A questionnaire addressed to this question was mailed to 2,193 schools of higher education during the school year 1970-1971 by Brian Driscoll,

---

[3]Stuart Adams, ibid.

[4]M. Patrick McCabe and Brian Driscoll, "College Admission Opportunities and the Public Offender", (National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Volume 17, No. 1, May, 1972).

[5]McCabe and Driscoll, ibid.

one of the authors of the above cited study. While only 705 usable responses (32%) were received, sufficient data was presented to indicate a pattern, as indicated by the answers to

> "Does the existence of a past criminal record automatically disqualify an applicant? (18% yes; 82% no)
>
> "Is the past criminal record of an applicant a major factor in regards to his admission? (53% yes; 47% no)
>
> "Does your college or university take into consideration the past criminal record of an applicant for admission? (71% yes; 29% no)[6]

McCabe and Driscoll consider the information concerning the admissions policies for ex-felons by <u>type</u> of institution as of major significance.

> "The data indicate a much more responsive attitude by universities and two-year colleges than by four-year colleges. This could be rather significant for two reasons:
>
> 1. Many of the released inmate college students have accumulated a rather large number of credit-hours while confined and are therefore unable to take advantage of a receptive two year college system.
>
> 2. There are only one-third as many universities as four-year colleges in the U.S. This serves as a further limiting factor in regard to selecting appropriate institutions for each student. 68% of the colleges would accept offenders, compared with 84% of the universities and 88% of the junior/community colleges."[7]

A receptive attitude toward admitting an ex-felon, however, does not mean that a college or university automatically accepts for admission any such individual who applies. McCabe and Driscoll cite

---

[6] McCabe and Driscoll, ibid.

[7] McCabe and Driscoll, ibid.

several experiences which indicate that released offenders from federal and state prison systems will find the odds against their being accepted as degree students, even by some colleges which have provided college-level programs in penal institutions! Refusal of a college to admit an ex-prison inmate "who has worked hard to prove himself academically and socially capable of handling college work"[8] can be especially damaging to the individual, his hopes and aspirations, and contribute heavily to the high recidivism rates of ex-offenders.

As McCabe and Driscoll report:

> "Students of penology have long been aware of the tragic loss of continuity which so often fails to bridge the gap between institutional programs that are designed to remedy academic and training deficiencies and post-release programs....
>
> "College-level instruction is certainly no exception. If an inmate remedies his academic deficiencies and begins a college-level program while confined but is refused admission to an appropriate college or university following his release, the continuity is again broken. Once this occurs, the most modern and effective of all institutional programs becomes totally impotent as a rehabilitative tool."[9]

An approach to resolving the problem of discontinuity has been effectively demonstrated by the Newgate Project of the University of Kentucky at the Federal Youth Center in Ashland, Kentucky. Dr. McCabe is director of the project. Designed essentially as an educational and counseling program, Newgate has the added feature of college placement and fieldwork for each released student. Consequently, college acceptance of each released student is a must for the project to achieve its objective. Sufficient success, including a less than 10% recidivism

---

[8] McCabe and Driscoll, ibid.

[9] McCabe and Driscoll, ibid.

rate, has persuaded the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue funding of this project, as well as similar programs in five other states.

If as many as 25,000 prison inmates will be enrolled in college-level programs within the immediate future, it is incumbent upon higher education officials and correctional institution educators to assure the continuity of a college education for these inmates upon their release, if any want to continue towards a degree. Without such assurance, our nation's educational system is simply perpetrating another hoax on a segment of our population least able to cope with many of life's vicissitudes.

The successes of Project Newgate should be replicated in every state and federal penal system in cooperation with all public two- and four-year institutions of higher education. At the very least, each public college and university should examine its admissions policy for ex-offenders to make certain that a "receptive attitude" does not result in a "no admissions" practice.

The irrationality of many admissions policies and practices of our institutions of higher education present more than enough hurdles for ex-offenders to overcome. But accepting a prison inmate as a college student and then refusing him such status upon release from prison must rank high on the list of absurdities.

CHAPTER 7

Current Studies by National Educational Organizations

During the past decade, the few major studies, along with action for changes in admission policies and practices relating to college transfer students, have been funded, supported, sponsored, or conducted by one or more national educational organizations, either in consortium, cooperatively, or alone. In an effort to determine whether or not any such studies are currently in process, the following 26 organizations were questioned early in May 1972:

American Council on Education
American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Associated Colleges of the Midwest
Association of University Evening Colleges
Association of American Colleges
Association of American Universities
College and University Personnel Association
National University Extension Association
American Association for Higher Education
American College Public Relations Association
American Association of University Professors
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities
Cooperative College Registry
Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
National Association of Colleges and University Business Officers
Federation of Regional Accrediting Admissions in Higher Education
National Association of Collegiate Deans and Registrars
Adult Education Association of the U.S.
College Entrance Examination Board
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
National Catholic Educational Association
American Society for Engineering Education
National Commission on Accrediting

As of May 31, replies had been received from 23 of the organizations. One of these had recently sponsored a report of peripheral interest to the problem of transfer students, two are currently sponsoring a report, three are jointly considering planning a conference, and two are actively engaged in conducting projects concerning transfer students. Brief analyses of this current activity follows: While the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers is not currently engaged in any studies of transfer students and course credits, it should be noted that its quarterly journal and annual reports contain numerous papers on this subject. Also, AACRAO is officially represented on policy making committees of a number of other national educational associations. It is doubtful that any major change in college admissions policies and practices relating to transfer students could be adopted on a national scale without the support and endorsement of AACRAO.

a. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, along with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, under the auspices of the American College Testing Program,are involved in preliminary discussions which will lead to a conference/workshop and a study on the problems of articulation. Funding from a foundation is presently being sought for this project.

The Association is responsible for the recently published report by Dr. Robert F. Carbone, Voting Rights and the Non-Resident Student, discussed in Chapter 2 of this paper.

b. College Entrance Examinations Board

Dr. Warren W. Willingham, senior research psychologist and director of the Access Research Office of the College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, California, recently completed a research report on articulation problems between two and four year institutions for ERIC. Dr. Willingham is a long-time researcher and authority on the subject of the college transfer student. His report, published July, 1972, titled, The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division, is discussed in Chapter 3 of this paper.

c. American Association for Higher Education

The American Association for Higher Education sponsored a recently published report by ERIC on March 1, 1972, on Veterans in College, written by Brent Breedin. Dr. Breedin was associate director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at that time.

d. Association of University Evening Colleges

The Military Affairs Committee of the Association of University Evening Colleges is currently engaged in a study of the problems of college transfer students with particular reference to Armed Services personnel.

e. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Previously reported in some detail in the section of this paper concerning Armed Services personnel, is the current project of The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges to establish Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges. The Association is officially represented on almost every committee, and every effort in higher education relating to resolving problems of the transfer student.

f. The American Council on Education

Previously reported in some detail in the section of this paper concerning Armed Services personnel, is the Committee on Institutional Cooperation's current project to publish a guide to opportunities in liberal arts and sciences for the itinerant student. While not a unit of ACE, a staff member works with the Committee.

The Office of Research of ACE is engaged in several studies which will reveal some information of importance to the subject of college student transfers. Such information, however, is only incidental to the main studies. For example, in its large-scale annual survey of entering college freshmen resulting in annual follow-up normative reports, its report for the 1966-67 class[1] indicated the following information concerning student transfer plans after the first year for all types of institutions.

	Male	Female
Did not leave, do not plan to return to same college	9.0	11.1

This same information is shown by various types of colleges, but it is only one item among a number of others. Additional normative studies will be published for later classes in the near future.

In another recently initiated study, conducted jointly with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the ACE has sent a questionnaire to college students, former students and faculty members throughout the U.S. soliciting information and opinions on a variety of subjects.

---

[1] Alan E. Bayer, David E. Drew, Alexander W. Astin, Robert F. Boruch, and John A. Creager, The First Year of College; a Follow-Up Normative Report, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., February 1970.

Among the questions, several are related to the subject of transfer of course credits, as follows:

> In total, how many different colleges have you enrolled in?
>
> Have you ever enrolled in a junior college?
>
> Since first entering college, have you ever dropped out for a term or longer?

Recognizing that the Research Division has given too little attention to the transfer student, its assistant director suggested the possibility of a study, if requested by the Federal Interagency Council on Education. As an immediate initial effort, probably at no cost to FICE, a one-page questionnaire could be developed for some very well defined problems which would be sent to 560 cooperating institutions of higher education. More detailed studies on a larger scale could possibly be planned for the future.

The American Council on Education is among the leading national higher education organizations involved in helping resolve the problems of the transfer student.

5. Additional National Studies

Undoubtedly there are national studies concerning transfer students and course credits which have not come to the attention of this researcher. For example, by sheer accident the following description of a study was found among a miscellany of research reports.

> Non-Traditional Study: OR 7290. The Commission on Non-Traditional Study, under a grant from the Carnegie Commission, is conducting an inventory of institutional resources for non-traditional study in colleges and universities. The Commission's interests range from technically-aided instruction and individualized programs to extended offerings and external degrees. Questionnaires were sent

CHAPTER 8

Summary of Major Findings; Some Additional Comments, Questions, and a Recommendation

During the last decade, a number of researchers and observers in the field of higher education have been calling for change in many of the policies, practices and procedures used by colleges and universities in accepting undergraduate transfer students and courses for degree credit. What little attention has been given to reform, has been mostly minor and superficial. Fortunately, however, there is currently taking place in institutions of higher education a convergence of external and internal societal, humanistic, educational and economic forces which promise to soon alter the conventional attitudes of faculty, admissions officers, administrators, and governing boards toward the transfer student.

First and foremost is the precipitous decline in the rate of increase in enrollment of college freshmen during the past two years. This decline promises to continue for some time in the future, and has already been felt in absolute numbers by large private universities and some state systems of higher education, including junior and community colleges. At the same time, the ratio of new transfer students to freshmen has risen from 7.5 percent in 1963 to 8.1 percent in 1968. While total enrollments continue to rise, the composition of the student body is expected to change. More mature and more non-traditional students will be seeking college degrees, many of them with previous college courses or life experiences creditable toward a degree.

These facts are not lost on college administrators who are beginning to realize that transfer students now comprise a major part of their student body -- nationally at least one-third, and on some campuses, as much as one-half. Given the financial straits with which practically all institutions of higher education are currently wrestling, admissions officers and administrators may soon find it necessary to woo transfer students instead of treating them as second and third-class citizens of academe. By the same token, faculties may soon find it necessary, to also woo students by liberalizing the restrictive criteria they have imposed on admissions officers in their institutions for admitting transfer students to major programs of study. The economic law of supply and demand works equally effectively in the field of education as it does in the market place! "Publish or perish" may or may not be a criterion for promotion and tenure of faculty members, but "no students - no faculty" takes precedence as a basic factor in determining continuing employment.

As faculty members become concerned with liberalizing admissions criteria to increase student enrollments in their major programs, so will the some 40 accrediting associations representing major disciplines and professions in higher education. Many of these associations, consisting of practitionrs in the field and the professors in the universities who train the practitioners, have been responsible for establishing nationally applicable restrictive admissions policies for transfer students in an effort to admit "only the best." While the practitioners may want to limit entry of new people into their field of specialization, the professors will not be so accommodating as to "self-destruct."

The sheer weight of the increasing numbers of individuals in civilian life--as well as in the Armed Forces, and prisons--and veterans who are seeking a college education and degree through various optional and non-traditional methods not generally available as few as ten years and even five years ago must have an impact on colleges and universities. The processing of the several hundreds of thousands more transfer students who will be seeking admission to institutions of higher education within the next few years is bound to force simplification and standardization of the transfer process. Several trends are already evident to support the estimated increase in magnitude over the currently estimated 541,000 transfer students admitted annually:

1. It is estimated that in 1972 the number of civilians taking CLEP examinations will be almost double the total number who took the examinations during the previous year.

2. For the first time, late in 1972, arrangements have been made between the Department of Defense and the College Entrance Examination Board for administering the CLEP Subject tests to Armed Service personnel and their dependents, as well as overseas civilian employees. This may well result in at least doubling the CLEP examinations passed in 1971 to about 150,000 per year in the very near future.

3. The New York State Board of Regents' newly announced degrees in Associate of Arts, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, and Associate of Arts in Nursing which can be earned entirely by examinations which are open to anyone in the U.S. will undoubtedly attract many thousands of individuals. In addition, several other states are expected to announce the same type of external degree program. New Jersey already has. This new movement should result each year in additional thousands of people who, having earned external lower division degrees, will want to transfer their college credits to continue their education toward a bachelor's degree in resident colleges.

4. The use of pass/fail and other non-traditional grading practices by colleges and universities is already creating difficulties for receiving colleges in determining grades for courses and calculating grade-averages for transfer students. Since the use of pass/fail grades is growing among institutions of higher education, particularly in preparing transcripts for transfer students, traditionally oriented admissions offices are already being forced to liberalize their policies and practices with regard to such transfer students.

5. Growing acceptance of the idea that many individuals should not complete their college education immediately after high school, but should "drop out" and "drop into" college over a period of years, will further increase the number of entering transfer students into colleges throughout the United States.

All of these factors, which have taken shape within just the past few years, must affect college transfer admissions policies. It will simply be impossible for admissions officers to justify the tremendous increase in staff which would be necessary to cope with the increased workload under traditional practices and procedures. Furthermore, equating prestige with restrictive admissions practices is an untenable position, and is being abandoned by a growing number of colleges and universities. And with state sytems of higher education responsible for a major share of state expenditures, it would be foolish indeed to believe that the public and state legislators will long allow the publically supported colleges and universities to reject or restrict large numbers of their own state students seeking to transfer from one college to another within the state. Particularly, since so many researchers have characterized many of the restrictive practices as evidence of mere "whim and fancy" and even outright "absurdities."

A major movement to bring some order and system into the transfer process -- at least within state systems of higher education and between

clusters of junior and community colleges within a geographic area served by a senior institution -- is the development of voluntary articulation agreements. Some state systems have already legislatively mandated, and others are reported planning to require articulation agreements throughout the entire state system. Experience with these articulation agreements, however, indicates that they are extremely complex to negotiate, cumbersome in operation, difficult to administer, and do little in the way of simplifying or standardizing the admissions process for either the so-called traditional or non-traditional transfer student, courses or programs of studies.

Although it has only been since 1965 that researchers have been studying the dilemma of the college transfer process in any depth, dissatisfaction with the slow rate, if any, of progress in achieving reforms has prompted some observers to call for federal action of one sort or another. They point to the fact that the Federal Government heavily subsidizes many phases of higher education throughout the Nation, and that it has the duty to intervene -- through issuance of regulations and guidelines under which states receive federal funds for colleges and universities -- to assure fair and just treatment of students who transfer from one institution to another, particularly those students who seek to enter a college in another state. These observers consider higher tuition rates and different admissions requirements for out-of-state students as discriminatory, restrictive of interstate commerce, and even more importantly, as having the effect of changing an important facet of American life, i.e., lessening the mobility of our citizenry. While the

courts have supported state sytems of higher education in such practices in the past, recent decisions have ruled against differential tuition rates for students who have been declared eligible to vote in the state in which they are attending school.

However, Federal Government intervention by fiat at this moment in time to reform policies and practices of higher education institutions concerning transfer students does not appear to be justified. It is believed that too little time has elapsed since the dilemma of the transfer student emerged as a major problem, and that the solutions offered thus far have not been particularly well-taken. Furthermore, the series of internal and external events emerging and impinging on institutions of higher education, as described herein, have not yet been given the opportunity to have their full impact in forcing liberalization, simplification and standardization of transfer policies and practices. It has been suggested, and is so recommended in this paper, that the federal government's role in this matter at this time should be that of catalyst and leader in helping our Nation's sytem of higher education to plan and effect needed changes as the institutions and their representative national associations themselves see and understand the need.

One strategy for assuming this leadership role is for the U.S. Office of Education (or possibly the Federal Interagency Committee on Education) to sponsor, or arrange for the sponsorship of a conference (or series of conferences) of concerned national higher education associations, institutional representatives, and recognized authorities to discuss the questions presented in this paper, as well as others which may be proposed, concerning the problems of the transfer student and

transfer of course credits. Implementation of any recommendations which may arise from the conference (or conferences) should be the responsibility of the concerned national educational organizations and their member institutions, with assistance from the federal government as may be requested and possible. Only if this strategy should fail in achieving substantial reform in the collegiate transfer process would the federal government be justified, it is felt, in taking any direct action by means of new laws or issuance of regulations in connection with grants, etc.

Following are several questions which might serve as basic agenda items for the recommended conference(s). The text which follows each question is included for clarification purposes and does not necessarily present all the pros and cons which may be found in the text of this paper. It is understood that these are <u>questions</u> -- <u>not recommendations</u> -- for discussion. Many other questions for discussion and needed resolution may be found in the text and appendices of this paper.

1. <u>What is the Possibility and Desirability for Establishing an Orderly System for Collection of National Data Concerning the Undergraduate College Transfer Student and How Could This be Accomplished?</u>

There is very little valid data on a national scale concerning the transfer student, his characteristics, numbers, mobility, needs, problems, etc. Almost all national research data on entering students in college has been confined to freshmen. As transfer students are beginning to comprise from one-third to one-half of the collegiate student body, however, this same type of information must be gathered on a continuing basis to allow researchers and college officials to develop appropriate plans to accommodate this type of student.

Particular attention needs to be addressed to Armed Services personnel while in service, and as veterans, concerning their present college status as well as transfer students. While much data are available concerning the education and training of the military, it does not lend itself to analysis, other than speculation, in terms of impact of military personnel as transfer students in colleges and universities throughout the U.S. It is quite possible that the Department of Defense might have to conduct a study in-depth of this problem over a period of time.

It should be noted that this particular moment in time is most propitious for planning the type of data, how it is to be collected, and by which agency or organization. Very little national data exists currently because it is only within the past few years that the role and dilemma of the undergraduate college transfer student has been recognized as of major importance in higher education.

The possible roles of the Research Division of the American Council on Education, the Department of Defense, and the National Center for Educational Statistics of the U.S. Office of Education, in the collection and dissemination of appropriate national data should be clearly developed on a cooperative basis. Consideration should also be given to the frequency of data collection on a national basis as well as special subject interim reports.

It should be noted that the Research Division of the American Council on Education may be willing, upon request from FICE, to immediately conduct a special study of some clearly defined transfer student problems among 560 cooperating colleges and universities. This study might well research the question as to what should be studied on a national basis.

Recommendations should also be developed as to how a systematic and continuing collection of transfer student data can best be financed.

2. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Establishing a Nationally Acceptable Policy of Using "Satisfactory" as the Recognized Grade for Courses Being Submitted by Transfer Students to Receiving Institutions for Course Exemption and Degree Credit, and How Could This be Accomplished?

It has been suggested that a receiving college needs only to know that a student has satisfactorily passed a course being submitted for transfer credit. If this is true, then why shouldn't that information be shown on the transcript without indicating any "failed" courses, or letter grades. With only this type of information available on the transfer student's transcript, receiving colleges would perforce discontinue their, according to many researchers, meaningless, time-consuming, costly, and pseudo-scientific grade-point averaging computations. The grade point average is almost universal among institutions of higher education as the basis for admitting or rejecting transfer students. Use of the "Satisfactory" grade on transfer transcripts would be a major reform in leading to simplification and standardization of the course credit transfer process.

Adoption of this concept need not necessarily lead to eliminating letter grades for intra-institutional purposes, e.g., in the awarding of honors, financial aid, etc. It should be noted however, that a growing number of colleges and universities are using pass-fail grades for both internal and external purposes.

3. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Establishing Nationally Accepted Normative Cut-Off Scores for All CLEP Examinations so as to Eliminate the Need for Institutional Normative Studies and Differing Cut-Off Scores by Colleges and Universities, and How Could This be Accomplished?

At the present time the Council on College-Level Examinations recommends the 50th percentile as the cut-off score for accepting

CLEP Subject Examinations for degree credit but makes no recommendations for the General Examinations. The Commission on Accrediting Service Experience (CASE) of the American Council on Education recommends the 25th percentile for the CLEP General Examinations and the 50th percentile for the Subject Examinations. Both organizations also suggest the value to individual colleges and universities of conducting institutional normative studies so as to determine their own cut-off scores and amount of credit to be awarded for both types of examinations. This has resulted in a wide array of practices. For example, CASE recommends six units of credit for each of the five tests in the General Examination for a total of 30 credits or one year's work. CLEP makes no recommendation at all. Some colleges and universities give as much as two years' credit for the General Examinations; others give much less. Nor does either CLEP or CASE suggest specific courses to be exempted by the CLEP General Examinations, leaving this matter to individual institutions.

Has there been sufficient experience with the CLEP examinations so that the CLEP Council is now in the position to make specific recommendations as to courses to be exempted and credit hours granted which could be adopted on a national scale? If not, are there plans to do so in the future?

As an ideal situation, probably unattainable, the adoption of one set of standards for application by all institutions of higher education in the acceptance and use of the CLEP examination results would resolve many of the problems now plaguing colleges and universities in handling non-traditional studies and grades for transfer credit purposes.

4. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Utilizing CLEP Subject Examination Research for Developing a Broad Base of General Education and Introductory Major Program Courses Which Will be Accepted by all Institutions of Higher Education at Face Value for Transfer Purposes, and How Could This be Accomplished?

In order to develop a CLEP Subject Examination, the test developers must first determine that there are a sufficiently large number of institutions of higher education which cover the same general body of knowledge under a particular course title. For example, if a CLEP examination is available for Sociology 1, there is assurance that most colleges and universities are teaching pretty much the same subject content for Sociology 1. If this were not true, then the CLEP examination for that course would be useless. Thus, a student who has satisfactorily completed a course in Sociology 1 for which a CLEP examination is available, should be able to transfer the course credits to any other institution in the U.S. without the receiving institution studying the previous college's catalog to determine whether or not there is any similarity in the courses offered by both institutions under the title "Sociology 1." The fact that the CLEP examination exists for that course is proof enough that sufficient similarity does exist.

There are currently 34 CLEP Subject Examinations, and there will soon be more. They cover a wide range of general education and introductory major program courses offered by many colleges and universities. If these courses, when taken by a resident student, were to be given the same acceptance as the CLEP examinations for the courses, the transfer process would be considerably simplified for both students and institutions. Furthermore, the institutions would save considerable admissions office staff time through the simplification of the transfer process which would be achieved.

It should be noted that this concept still permits faculty of four-year institutions to establish their individual departmental requirements for upper division major study programs.

5. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Eliminating Higher Tuition Rates and Admission Standards for Out-of-State Transfer Students by Means of Reciprocity Agreements Between the States, and How Could This be Accomplished?

A peculiar provincialism is being demonstrated by many state systems of public higher education in that higher admissions standards and tuition rates are being applied to out-of-state residents. These policies have had three effects:

a. Most college students now attend and transfer to institutions within their home states in order to save money.

b. There is a greater socioeconomic and cultural diversity of the student body than existed in the past.

c. Geographical diversity of college student bodies is on the wane. This type of mix was a major goal of many institutions not too many years ago.

Since both cultural and geographical diversity are desirable in the student bodies of colleges and universities, some action is needed to discontinue unilateral action on the part of states to limit and even eliminate out-of-state students in publicly supported colleges. One suggestion of considerable merit is the use of reciprocal agreements between states to not discriminate between each other's resident students, and/or for each state to pay tuition costs for any of its students attending college in another state. These agreements might even include a national or several regional clearinghouses to maintain the records of tuitions due each state. The net effect could well be mere bookkeeping instead of any transfer of funds.

It is believed that the pendulum has swung too far from unlimited acceptance of out-of-state residents by public colleges and universities

to quotas and even restrictive practices which strongly militate against mobility of college students throughout the U.S.

6. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Expanding the Servicemen's Opportunity College Concept for Junior and Community Colleges to Include Senior Institutions, and How Could This be Accomplished?

One of the most important and far reaching developments in recent years in providing college education opportunities for military personnel is the development of the concept of the Servicemen's Opportunity Colleges. Selected junior and community colleges under this concept, become in effect the "home college" for military personnel college students. Developed jointly by the Department of Defense and a task force of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, this program provides for the SOC to offer the enrolled servicemen necessary academic and career counseling for a program of studies leading to a college degree, regardless of college attended or how course work is completed. As the serviceman or servicewoman acquires credits for completed college work, the records are sent back to the SOC in which he or she originally enrolled. So long as the college work is in accordance with the academic plan agreed upon (or revised with approval of the SOC), credit is applied to the degree. When the AA degree is earned, it is conferred by the SOC without any additional residency requirement on the part of the student.

The SOC plan is now in effect in several cooperating junior and a few senior colleges. It is hoped to expand this number in the near future. Consideration might be given to including more four-year institutions in this concept as soon as possible so that military service personnel so desiring, could plan their program of studies for a bachelor degree. This could help eliminate present practices of many military personnel who acquire a smorgasbord of college-level courses, many of which have

no relationship to a degree program. While they could still take college courses for reasons other than acquiring a degree, at least they will know what courses they do need to take to obtain a degree.

7. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Establishing a National Examining and Accrediting University for Non-Traditional Students and Study Programs by Expanding the Responsibilities and Functions of the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE), and How Could This be Accomplished?

The idea of a national examining and accrediting university to serve the needs and to promote programs of non-traditional studies and college degrees for non-traditional students is being recommended by a number of recognized authorities in higher education. Some of the responsibilities and functions suggested for this new university are already being provided by the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE) of the American Council on Education. If the National Examining University concept has merit, CASE might be the logical organization to develop this concept.

The experience and expertise CASE has already developed in providing guidelines for institutions of higher education in granting college credit for technical training in the Armed Services could easily be applied to determining college credit recommendations for civilian vocational and technical training in post-secondary institutions. There is an imperative need for such recommended guidelines since most colleges and universities will not provide college credit for such courses in civilian schools, but will for Armed Services schools.

CASE's experience and expertise in helping develop the General Educational Development (GED) testing program and the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) correspondence courses and tests is not

equaled by any other organization or group of people in the United States.

Starting with these programs, the National University could expand its services and programs to promote and accredit new types of non-traditional study programs, maintain a national record-keeping and transcript preparation service for non-traditional students and course credits, and issue its own degrees based either entirely on examinations, or a combination of examinations, life experiences, course credits earned in residence, correspondence courses, etc., as the New York State Board of Regents is now doing with its external degree program. The National University could provide these services for civilians as well as for members of the Armed Services. This last point is particularly important because the Air Force is attempting to meet these very needs for its personnel through its Community College of the Air Force. This unilateral action of the Air Force may be followed by the other branches of the Armed Services. It would be much more logical for CASE to develop into the National University so as to eliminate the need for any Armed Services "community colleges."

If the "National University" concept is determined not feasible or viable, then there seems to be considerable merit in suggesting that the Department of Defense establish for all its military personnel an organizational unit to serve as a record repository, collector, and disseminator (upon request of individual Armed Service personnel) of transcripts of all educational and training experiences acquired during military service. In

effect, this would assume the major functions envisioned by the originators of the Community College of the Air Force. In providing transcripts, the Department of Defense unit might even include the CASE suggested college equivalency credit for each military training experience. Such a service unit could be extremely helpful to military personnel seeking to accumulate their records of education and training while in the Armed Services at such time as they enroll in a degree program at a college or university. Present practice requires the military, or the veteran, to write to all previous relevant institutions and organizational units for proof of educational and training background.

8. What is the Possibility and Desirability of Establishing a Special Commission to Develop a Rational Program for Transfer of Prison Inmate College Students to Regular College Students Upon Release from Prison, and How Could This be Accomplished?

With growing numbers of prison inmates (estimated to reach 25,000 in the near future) engaged in college-level studies as a means of "abilitation through education" it is a shock for many -- upon release -- to find it extremely difficult if not impossible to be accepted as a regular student by a number of institutions of higher education. Discontinuity of educational programs by prisoners has been cited by authorities as one of the major reasons for ex-offender recidivism.

The successes of Project Newgate in five states (see Chapter 6) for effecting smooth transfer of prison inmate college-level students to college campuses upon release indicates the possibility of developing similar programs in most other states, at least between prisons and publicly-supported colleges and universities. A special committee of college and university officials, together with prison educators, might well study Project Newgate and other like efforts, to eliminate discriminatory college admissions practices being applied to ex-offenders.

The specific problems posed by such practices cannot be allowed to continue; they have too considerable a negative impact on our nation's law-enforcement, crime-prevention, and prison reform efforts.

9. What is the Possibility and Desirability of the Regional Accrediting Associations Adopting Policies Relating to the Problems of Admission, Counseling, Financial Aid, etc., Dealing with Undergraduate College Transfer Students, and How Could This be Accomplished?

While the Commissions on Higher Education of the Regional Accrediting Associations have adopted certain policies and practices dealing with admission of freshmen students, and other policies and practices dealing with all students in colleges accredited by the Association, the only specific policy concerned with transfer students is in the area of applicants from unaccredited colleges and universities. It is believed that it is timely for the Commissions to develop and adopt policies which are much more positive and constructive in helping resolve the diverse, and in many instances, irrational and restrictive policies and practices which adversely affect the transfer student. The National Commission on Accrediting and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education are aware of these problems and undoubtedly would want to participate in any national effort designed to resolve them.

It may also be possible for the Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education to consider establishing policies and procedures to facilitate the adoption of core curricula in general education during the first two years of college which will be acceptable for transfer by all other institutions of higher education. It seems that if accreditation is to have any viable meaning at all, it should certainly indicate at least this minimal credibility among our nation's colleges and universities.

A Final Word

The above questions reveal but a sampling of the many problems plaguing college and university administrators, as well as transfer students, concerning the admissions and other policies, practices and procedures affecting the transfer process. Many other questions, discussed in this paper and suggested by several reviewers makes it abundantly clear that any study of the transfer student and his problems must inevitably merge into a study of all facets of higher education. As more and more high school graduates and their families regard college education as a right to be exercised at any time during their lifetime, it is obvious that traditional admissions practices which interfere with that perceived right will not be allowed to long continue. Thus, we must conclude that the dimensions of the dilemma of the college transfer student cannot be measured by either the numbers of students involved, nor the attitudes of institutions of higher education and their bureaucracies. The real measure in the U.S. lies in the strength of the hopes and aspirations of all who seek and are capable of realizing the benefits of higher education, whenever they desire, whoever they may be, wherever they are.

APPENDIX A

Some Major Policies and Practices of Admissions Offices Relating to Applicants Seeking Transfer From One Institution of Higher Education to Another

The following listing of admissions policies and practices relating to college transfer students is neither all-inclusive, nor do the brief discussions of the factors listed present all the variations and mutations of the many procedures involved. Furthermore, the text of this paper refers in greater detail to some of the policies, practices and procedures presented herein. Reference is also directed to Appendices B and C.

A. Determining Accreditation or Non-Accreditation of the Previous College.

If the previous college(s) is not an accredited institution, most accredited institutions will not accept any courses taken for transfer, unless the previous institution can prove it is in the process of becoming accredited. Even in these instances, the receiving college may require that the student have higher grades in the courses submitted for transfer than if the courses were taken at an already accredited institution.

To assist the admissions offices in making such decisions, the American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers annually publishes its Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions as a guide for its membership. to obtain the information in this Report (which is referred to as the "bible" by most admissions officers), a representative of a member institution in each state is asked to provide a list of educational institutions in that state

above the secondary level, and to indicate the policy of his institution for accepting credit from the other listed institutions for that state. For each college listed, the following information is indicated:

(a) whether or not the college is accredited

(b) the highest level of college degree offered

(c) acceptance of credit by the reporting institution:

A - credit accepted

B - credit accepted on a limited basis

C - credit accepted provisionally

E - credit not accepted

I - insufficient information

Since there are over 2500 institutions of higher education in the U.S., the value of this Report to admissions officers is obvious. As can be expected, some colleges and universities utilize the information in the Report in a variety of unorthodox ways, not intended by AACROA, depending on the extent to which the institution applies restrictive admission policies.

B. Campus Residency Requirements

Almost all colleges and universities require that a student be enrolled full time for at least the last year of his studies in order to receive a degree from the institution. Thus a student who has attended several colleges over a period of years and accumulated enough course credits to satisfy the requirements for several bachelor degrees, would be given credit for only three years of study, and have to be a full-time student for one year of final

study at the institution from which he is seeking the degree. This policy works a particular hardship on Armed Services career personnel who may have taken courses at a number of colleges over a period of years but were never stationed long enough in one area to be considered a full-time student for one year. Even where he might have been able to attend a continuing education division of a college as a part-time student and received a degree, he was transferred before completing his studies. Furthermore, many colleges will not accept courses taken as a part-time student for transfer credit, even though the college offering the part-time courses will accept them for credit toward a degree.

C. Non-Traditional Grading Policies

A number of universities are using the "pass-fail" grading system. Most colleges interpret a "pass" grade as a C. Thus, if the receiving college requires a minimum grade of C+ or higher in order to accept a course for transfer, the "pass" graded course will not be accepted.

D. Course Credit and Exemption-by-Examination Policies

A number of colleges are utilizing the College Level Examination Program Subject Examinations in lieu of requiring students to enroll in a course. The student's transcript will simply indicate he has passed the course by taking the CLEP examination. If the receiving college does not utilize that particular CLEP Subject Examination, the course may not be accepted for transfer. If the receiving institution does utilize that particular CLEP examination, it may request the student to have his previous college forward the

score he received on the examination before accepting the course for credit since many institutions of higher education have established differing scores as acceptable despite the recommendations of the CLEP Council. Most colleges and universities, in accepting the CLEP examinations for course exemption and/or credit towards a degree, will not charge tuition for the exempted course; some colleges will charge tuition fee and others will charge an administrative fee.

E. D Grade Policies

Most colleges will not accept a course with a D grade for transfer. Some may if the overall Grade Point Average is high enough and the D grade was not earned in a major course. Some colleges will include D grades in computing the grade point average, and others will exclude the course if it is not a major. Some colleges will accept the D grade in a course if it is one of a sequence of courses, and a grade of C+ or higher was earned in the next course in sequence.

F. Required Courses

Some colleges require that certain courses in major areas of study must be taken for degree credit only at the institution. For example, many colleges of education require all methods courses be taken at their institution and will not accept for transfer any methods courses taken at previous colleges. There are many such special requirements established by faculty of the departments and schools of the institution, including higher grade point averages for particular departments or schools than are accepted for general admission to the institution.

G. Time-Lapse Policies

The problem of time-lapse since completion of previous study is handled differently by institutions. Some will not accept any courses for transfer which were taken five, eight, or ten years previously. Others will accept within this limit only social science and liberal arts courses. Still others will accept any work previously satisfactorily completed at any time. And others may require the student to take an examination if he wants credit for a course over ten years old.

H. Differing Calendars for School Year

If the receiving college is on a course basis (e.g., 32 courses required for a bachelor's degree) and the previous college is on a semester, quarter, or tri-semester basis, the receiving college must convert the credit hours into a course basis. Besides the inordinate amount of time involved for computing the conversions for each course acceptable for credit, the student frequently loses some credit hours in the process.

I. Parallel Course Policies

Most colleges will accept for transfer credit only those courses taken in previous colleges which are parallel to ones offered by the receiving college. Since the transcript shows only the course title, the receiving college will refer to its library of college catalogs, going back many years, for a description of the course in the previous college. If the body of knowledge covered by the course, as described in the catalog, generally covers the same body of knowledge

of a course offered by the receiving college, it will be accepted. Otherwise the course will not be accepted for credit, even though it may carry the same title as a course offered by the receiving college.

Another factor which enters into acceptance of course for transfer is whether or not the course is a required or elective course for the major program of studies in which the student is enrolled. If all the courses being offered for transfer are considered electives by the receiving college, and they exceed the number of electives allowed, the extra courses can be accepted but will not be credited toward degree status.

Of particular significance in this matter are the ethnic courses being offered minority groups on many campuses. It is very rare that these same courses would be offered for degree credit in many other colleges. Thus, minority students who enroll in such courses, and transfer to another institution, frequently lose credit for those courses.

In efforts to overcome the considerable amount of time spent by admissions office personnel in reviewing catalogs of previous institutions to determine parallelism of courses, a number of geographically associated institutions of higher education have established "articulation agreements" whereby they have agreed that a particular numbered and named course in one institution will be accepted for transfer credit in another institution which offers the approximately same subject matter coverage under a different course number and name. While there are many problems associated with keeping these

agreements current because of frequent change of course content, addition and deletion of courses, the agreements do serve a useful purpose.

J. Minimum Number of Credit-Hour Policies

Many institutions of higher education have established policies concerning class level status to which a transfer student will be admitted based on a minimum number of credit hours or courses, regardless of what his status was in the previous institution. Frequently, a student who has sophomore or junior status in his previous college will find himself considered a freshman because a number of his previous courses were not accepted for credit. When this happens, admissions policies and practices applicable to entering freshmen are applied by the receiving university. This means submission of the high school transcript, etc., etc.

K. Correspondence School Courses

Few traditionally oriented colleges and universities will accept for transfer credit any courses completed by correspondence except those correspondence courses offered by accredited colleges and universities. A number of universities will accept a varying number of college level correspondence courses -- usually no more than the equivalent of one year's credit hours -- completed in an accredited collegiate institution with a grade of C or higher, provided the correspondence course is applied by the institution offering it for credit towards a degree. Those correspondence courses accepted must satisfy the requirements of the undergraduate major program in which the student is enrolling at the receiving institution.

L. Special Policies Designed for Veterans and Armed Services Personnel

Most colleges and universities will accept for transfer many of the educational courses and training programs, provided by the Armed Services for its personnel, if the courses can be utilized toward the fulfillment of a degree, either as a required or an elective course. The Admissions Office personnel utilize the widely accepted American Council on Education's Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services for determining the amount of equivalent college credit hours to be applied to each course taken by the veteran or Armed Services personnel.

Practically all institutions of higher learning also accept for transfer any college level United States Armed Forces Institute correspondence or extension course satisfactorily completed if the course applies to the students degree program at the receiving institution. However, a number of institutions will not accept for credit any such courses completed only by USAFI end-of-course examinations.

Through a combination of USAFI correspondence courses and educational and training programs in Armed Services schools, etc., it is possible to receive as much as two years credit toward a degree in many colleges and universities. Additional credit of up to one year may be granted for applicable courses taken at accredited institutions of higher learning. However, practically all colleges and universities require a minimum of one year credit hours or courses in residence for awarding of the degree. This residence requirement is almost always the final year before graduation. Thus if a student had spent his freshman year in residence, he must still spend his senior year in residence to obtain a degree.

APPENDIX B

Critical Articulation Incidents and Problems of the College Student Transfer Process

Early in April, 1972, the University of Tennessee held a Statewide conference of college admissions officers and other officials to discuss the problems of articulation for students transferring from the junior to the senior colleges throughout the State. To provide a realistic base for the conference, officials were asked to supply examples of problems and episodes dealing with the student transfer process. Following are some of the incidents reported to the Conference Planners.

1. The most common incident of concern we experience is courses completed at the two-year college that are normally required at the junior/senior level. This affects that total upper division requirement for graduation. The student then must either repeat the course for upper level credit or take additional junior/senior courses to meet the minimum requirement; e.g., a student completes organic chemistry at a junior college. He indicates the same text book was used and other similar requirements. The senior institution disallows upper division credit.
2. A community college student is told by counselors that to actually receive the A.A. degree is of vital importance for transfer. Strict adherence to the A.A. degree program can result in a failure to meet lower division requirements at the four-year school. Actually, graduation from the community college with the A.A. degree is seldom among the major criteria used to determine admission to four-year institutions.

3. In many areas of study the senior college may require a 2.00 or "C" average for transfer after the completion of one year. A community college student could meet university admission requirements but would not qualify for admission to the major program of his choice if the department requires a higher Grade Point Average for its students.

4. I suppose our most frequent problem with two-year transfer students is their completion of at least seventy quarter hours of upper division work. Occasionally we have two-year transfer students who do not meet our graduated Grade Point Average scale. However, most of these students are eligible for admission if they have remained out of college work for at least one quarter after leaving the two-year colleges.

5. A student at a college or university experiences academic difficulty and attempts to transfer to a community college. He finds that the community college requires a "C" average for transfer. In such instances, the community college appears to have lost sight of its role as an open door institution with emphasis on teaching and counseling.

6. There are four-year public institutions in the State who do not accept a grade of "D", even when the student has an Associate Degree. This creates a hardship for some students.

7. A community college faculty attempts to be innovative in regard to curriculum only to find that four-year institutions will not accept the courses in their tradition-bound curriculum. After many frustrated attempts, the community college faculty resign themselves to mimicking the university.

8. Arbitrary and sudden curriculum changes by senior institutions without notifying the two-year institution creates time problems to our students when they transfer.

9. Prior to August of 1970, we accepted English Composition taken as extension work. If students graduate from the community college with extension credit in English Composition, will the four-year institution accept this? Our institution no longer accepts English Composition taken as extension work.

10. A student completes two years at a community college and transfers to a university. He later finds that he needs to attend a summer session at the community college near his home to take two lower division electives. He cannot avail himself of this opportunity to save time and money due to the senior college requirement that the last ninety hours presented for graduation must be completed in a senior college.

11. Tommy was a member of the first graduating class of Dyersburg State. He graduated with a cumulative Grade Point Average of 3.82. He was active in campus activities and seemed well-rounded. He transferred to the University of Tennessee at Martin and was told that he would have to audit MAT 2010 and 2020 before he could receive credit for those courses. He later withdrew from UTM without completing the first quarter.

12. Shawn attended Dyersburg State and was a member of the first graduating class. He transferred to the University of Tennessee at Martin and enrolled in the School of Liberal Arts. When he received his acceptance, he was notified that he had a math deficiency since he had earned only one credit in high school algebra.

Shawn had completed MAT 1110, 20, 30 at Dyersburg State and was unable to understand why he should have a deficiency in math since this sequence was all the math required for the degree he was seeking. He finally made a special request to the Committee on Degrees at UTM for a waiver; the Committee denied this request.

13. Tim Smith took Chemistry 111 at Tennessee Technological University and needs Chemistry 112, 113 to complete his chemistry requirements in Pre-Med.

    Our Chemistry sequence (1010-20-30) transfers to Tennessee Tech. as their General Chemistry (101-2-3) but not as 111-2-3. Chemistry 101-2-3 at Tech is a terminal course for those planning to take only one year of chemistry for curricula requiring more than one year of chemistry.

    The sequence at Roane State Community College, Chemistry 1010-20-30 will transfer to the University of Tennessee at Chemistry 1110-20-30 which is the required chemistry for Pre-Med at the University of Tennessee.

    Tim plans to return to Tech if he makes a B in Chemistry 1020 at Roane State; Tech will accept this as his required chemistry. If he makes a C he can go a quarter to U.T. where the chemistry series is accepted and then transfer to Tech and Tech will accept this as the required chemistry.

14. Four-year colleges seem too concerned with the detailed investigation of the Community College courses.

15. Course descriptions seem to be a problem especially in this area of political science. The following is a political science series at Roane State Community College:

Pol 1010 - Fundamentals of American Government

Pol 1020 - United States National Government

Pol 1030 - State and Local Government in the United States

The series transfers directly to the University of Tennessee as their 2210-20-30, American Government and Politics.

Pol 1010-20 transfers to Tennessee Tech. as their 222 American Government and Pol 1030 transfers as 222, State and Local Government.

The situation becomes more complicated when a student is transferring to a senior institution on the semester system. The Pol 1010-20 would probably transfer to Middle Tennessee State University as 221, 222 American Government, but the courses at Roane State Community College would be for six (6) quarter hours and the courses at M.T.S.U. represent six (6) semester hours. The same is true for Pol 1030 which represents three (3) quarter hours credit. This course would probably best transfer to M.T.S.U. as 328, State and Local Government, but the three (3) quarter hours would again be short of the three (3) semester hours at M.T.S.U.

Students who are taking Policital Science as an elective are not too concerned about the situation. But a student at R.S.C.C. who plans to major in Political Science and transfer to M.T.S.U. is faced with a difficult situation.

16. I am associated with advising and guiding in the area of pre-engineering. The major problem on transfer seems to be the lack of communication between the Dean of Admission for Engineering at UT and the various departments. There also is occasionally a problem in evaluation of transcript. Different courses are evaluated differently by different individuals. The major difficulty is that the Dean of Engineering and the head of the department do not agree on what courses might be accepted by the various departments, my division chairman and myself.

    Basically, I have reached agreement with the Dean of Engineering on which courses will transfer. When the students have their transcript sent and/or have a personel interview with the department chairmen they are not necessarily given full credit for all courses even though earlier agreement has been obtained. We have advised our students that if they are confronted with one of these problems they are to call or contact us immediately so we can take steps to correct the situation.

    We have few if any problems with our transfer students to the other institutions such as Tennessee Tech. and Georgia Tech.

17. Upper division credits. A policy of long-standing has been to require a minimum of 66 quarter hours of upper division work for the baccalaureate degree. It is inappropriate to allow upper division credit for work taken during the freshman and sophomore years. When students in two-year institutions take courses

which normally are taught during the junior and senior years in senior institutions, they sometimes experience difficulty in earning the full 66 quarter hours credit in the senior institution.

18. Financial aid. Frequently students who have participated in the financial aid program at the two-year institution are surprised to find that they are unable to receive financial assistance at the four-year institution. The question normally is not one of eligibility; rather, a question of the availability of funds. Many students seem to think that the transfer of eligibility for financial aid and its assignment to them is an automatic procedure.

19. We have counted and quantified until we have about reached the upper limits. When it comes to knowledge, which is presumably the mission of all of us, what difference does it really make if a quarter's credit is equivalent to a semester's credit?

APPENDIX C

Some Articulation Problems Within Selected State Systems of Higher Education

Excerpted and quoted from:

Frederick C. Kintzer, Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 15, University of California, Los Angeles, December, 1970.

Arizona

Many problems have been called to the attention of the Higher Education Coordinating Committee:

1. A double standard has been created because of colleges not transferring grades:
   a. It is possible for a transfer student to graduate Phi Kappa Phi even though he has a poor first year academically at some junior college. Since his grades do not transfer (only credits), his grade-point average at the university is calculated on a different basis from the native student's, whereas the latter must live with his first-year grades.
   b. The native student has an advantage at a university in that he can overcome a certain number of D's to graduate. The junior college transfer cannot apply the D's that he received at the junior college to graduation, since he cannot transfer them.

2. The junior colleges and the universities have different residence requirements. A student can, as a resident, attend the junior college in the State for one semester and then transfer to the university thinking that he is a resident, only to find out that he is not classified as such at the university.

3. The junior colleges have an open-door policy and, as a result, have many remedial courses not designed for transfer purposes. Students who have had to take remedial courses because of academic deficiencies graduate from the junior college only to find that, when they transfer to a university, they have less than a junior standing. The universities, as a result, are falsely accused of not accepting junior college credits.

California

All segments of public higher education in California, the university, the State colleges, and the community colleges, share responsibility for difficulties that tend to block the smooth operation of the California Plan for Articulation. Differences in philosophy exist: The university, partly because of its increasingly selective role, maintains exacting entrance requirements and insists on rigorous academic performance. Community colleges, as open-door institutions, take students where they find them and allow them to move along under more flexible standards. There are signs, however, to suggest that the university is becoming more flexible and the community colleges more exacting.

Impediments on the university-State college side are the tendencies to:

1. formalize curricular changes arbitrarily rather than cooperatively
2. shift courses from lower to upper division and, in general, obliterate the separation between the two divisions. (Community colleges, as earlier indicated, cannot offer upper-division work.)
3. limit the amount of transfer credit in certain fields, e.g., physical education, business education, and music
4. develop differing major fields and graduation requirements among schools and colleges on university campuses, and among the California State colleges.

Some community colleges present problems in that they:

1. fail to offer prerequisites for a course normally regarded as intermediate or specialized, or if prerequisites are established, fail to mention them in requests for recognition of the course
2. submit, for university-degree credit, courses that are at least partially vocational and, in the case of less experienced institutions, mix subcollegiate and collegiate material in transfer courses
3. fail to establish a system of managing articulation within the community college itself
4. rely on communication between community college professors and university professors rather than between articulation officers, e.g., deans of university colleges (through the University Office of Relations with Schools) and deans of instruction in community colleges.

Florida

(Editor's Note: Because Florida's sytem of articulation is considered as one of the few harbingers of the future, along with California, New York and Washington by Frederick C. Kintzer, the entire Florida report is reproduced below. There are 27 public comprehensive junior colleges in countywide districts or groups of counties.)

Background. Although one junior college was established in Florida in 1927, rapid growth did not occur until after 1957 legislation adopted the Community College Commission's Master Plan. Development has been explosive since that time. Two out of three freshmen now attend community colleges; a community college is located within commuting distance of the homes of 99 percent of the State's population.

Florida was the first (and still the only) State to develop and implement a Statewide transfer formula of general education requirements. A special committee for articulation activities, first organized in 1957 and reconstituted in 1966, gave it impetus and direction. Articulation problems were identified and task force committees were organized in various subject areas. Statewide conferences were preceded by a statement on expected requirements of lower-division courses. The Professional Committee gave attention to such matters as calendars, student organizations, and articulation problems in general. Recent State government reorganization has given added impetus to this committee -- it is currently in the process of being reconstituted to have representation from the Chancellor's Office of the University system, from the director's office of the Division of Community Colleges, and from the State Commissioner of Education.

Philosophy. The articulation pact outlined below is based on the understanding that transfer should be accomplished without roadblocks, that institutional integrity is of crucial importance. Education is recognized as "a continuous process even though handled in separate administrative units." Emphasis has recently been given to occupational education by major increases in State funding. The basic formula prepared and issued by the Florida State Department of Education and approved by the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education in 1965 states that:

> Junior college transfers should be considered as having met the general education requirements of the receiving senior institution if the junior college has certified that the student has completed the lower-division general education requirements of the junior college. This policy should apply to all junior college transfers, both graduates and nongraduates.

Policies and Procedures. Among the supporting policies are the following:

1. Requirements for admission to upper-division colleges and schools of the Florida public universities should be the same for Florida public junior college graduates as for students who complete the first two years on a university campus. Those transferring from the public junior colleges before graduation shall be treated as any other transfer student and must meet all university requirements for lower as well as upper divisions.

2. Admission to the upper division should be granted to any graduate of a State-accredited junior college in the State of Florida who has completed the college-parallel program and whose graduation shall normally be on the basis of an overall average of 2.00 based on the 4.00 system on all college work attempted. Junior college graduates should be permitted to make up prerequisites while in upper-division status. The university will consider exceptional cases, within the capacities of the university, on recommendation from the junior college and if space is available.

3. All credits of C or better should be received, accepted, and recorded on the transferring student's record by the receiving senior institution so that the upper-division colleges may determine how many additional hours are needed for graduation with a bachelor's degree. This would not necessitate the removal of minimum upper-division requirements for graduation but would protect the transferring student against loss of credits in excess of 64 hours when such courses are applicable to the degree the student is seeking.

4. The graduation requirements in effect at a receiving senior institution at the time a student enrolls at a public junior college should apply to that student in the same manner that graduation requirements of that senior institution apply to its native students, provided the student's attendance record is continuous.

5. Nothing in the above should obscure the fact that degree-granting institutions have a significant responsibility for insuring that the degree holder has a reasonable competency and an equal chance to compete in his chosen profession.

Problems. Changes in personnel are a major problem. Since articulation involves many decisions by many different people, it is difficult to keep agreements among institutions well understood and regularly implemented in the same measure, especially when such procedures are unlike more traditional decisions.

Future. Agreements recently developed by Department of Education administrators and representatives of the Board of Regents would:

1. Establish the Associate in Arts as the transfer degree
2. Create a coordinating committee to review individual student appeals
3. Recognize institutional integrity in decision-making. Community college students receiving the A.A. degree, for example, would be admitted as juniors in the university system. Determination of the major course requirements for the B.A. degree, including lower-division major courses, would be the responsibility of the State university awarding the degree. No State university would be allowed to require additional lower-division general education courses of the transfer students in the associate in arts degree program.

Reaching agreement on which courses are to be considered suitable for transfer will probably be the most difficult problem.

Illinois

Certain practices of senior institutions present transfer difficulties:

1. General education requirements differ in the various universities and among colleges within the universities, in terms of course sequences that fulfill the general education requirements for the degree. This makes it almost impossible for a student to select appropriate courses at the junior college unless he knows to what university and to what college within it he plans to transfer.
2. Different major field and graduation requirements have been developed by the various colleges and departments on several university campuses, both public and private. The junior college is, therefore, not able to say to a student, "If you complete this curriculum you will be able to go to any of the State universities and complete a bachelor's degree in a given field with two more years of upper-division work."

Problems in transfer of credit caused by junior college practices are:

1. Some junior colleges do not specify general education requirements for all baccalaureate-oriented two-year programs.
2. Content of many junior college courses is difficult to determine. This becomes a particular deterrent in transfer to specific fields.

3. Many junior colleges do not specify whether their courses are designed for transfer or for vocational and technical students. This makes it difficult for the director of admissions to know whether these courses actually prepare the student for university degree work.
4. Some junior colleges fail to inform students that many of their vocational-technical courses are not designed for transfer.
5. Some junior colleges report only passing grades.
6. Many junior colleges have no specific definition of a transfer student.

(Editor's Note: The following remarks concerning future plans of the higher education system in Illinois is of interest in that a number of other states are establishing policies, either legislatively or by common agreement, to give priority to state residents for admissions and transfer into the State's colleges and universities.)

Major growth at the University of Illinois is destined to be in the upper-division and graduate programs, particularly since the Illinois Board of Higher Education's Master Plan specifies that lower-division enrollments be held to current levels on all public State university campuses (except the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois and the Edwardsville campus of Southern Illinois University). Admissions policies are therefore being planned to encourage transfer at the junior level. This, it is felt, will increase the yield of bachelor degrees produced by the university system and make more effective use of the State's facilities.

Phase II of the Master Plan for Higher Education will result in the establishment of two upper-division and first-year-graduate universities, one beginning in the fall of 1970 and the other in the fall of 1971.

These institutions are being especially designed to accept junior college graduates, particularly majors in the humanities, social sciences, business and commerce, and education.

Policies now under consideration by the University Committee on Admissions include priority for Illinois junior college transfers who have completed two years of college work.